

282057

JPRS-TAC-86-068

22 AUGUST 1986

Worldwide Report

**ARMS CONTROL**

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

19990422 116

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

**FBIS**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

8  
92  
A05

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

22 AUGUST 1986

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Reagan's Comments Show No Compromise on SDI (Moscow Television Service, 30 Jul 86; Moscow TASS International Service, 7 Aug 86) .....	1
Not 'Bargaining Chip', by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy Deployment Planned .....	1
Soviet Army Paper Rebuts U.S. 'Demagoguery' on SDI (Yu. Soldatenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 30 Jul 86) .....	3
USSR: July-August Reports on U.S. SDI Debates (Various sources, various dates) .....	5
WALL STREET JOURNAL Cites Weinberger	5
Johns Hopkins Study on Cost	6
Physicist Cited on Dangers	6
U.S. Army Space Agency	7
Senate Vote on Funding, by Vladimir Pasko	8
Budget Debate	9
PRAVDA: SDI 'Blatant Violation' of ABM Treaty (V. Vereshchetin; Moscow PRAVDA, 4 Aug 86) .....	11
USSR's Israelyan Assails SDI in CD (Moscow TASS, 7 Aug 86) .....	15
Moscow TV Contrasts SDI, European Eureka Project (Vitaliy Ilyashenko; Moscow Television Service, 6 Aug 86)	16

PRAVDA View's Japan's Post-Election SDI Policy (Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jul 86) .....	17
Japanese Sources Cited on Prospects for SDI Decision (Tokyo KYODO, 16 Jul 86) .....	19
Japanese Ministers Move Toward 'West German' SDI Formula (Tokyo KYODO, 18 Jul 86) .....	20
FRG's FDP Official Criticizes Reagan SDI Statement (Hamburg DPA, 7 Aug 86) .....	21
<b>U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS</b>	
USSR's Petrovskiy on Reagan NST Letter, Test Ban, SALT (Vladimir Petrovskiy Interview; Budapest Television Service, 3 Aug 86) .....	22
FRG Papers Comment on Reagan Letter to Gorbachev (Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 28 Jul 86) .....	24
Canadian Editorials Discuss Reagan, Gorbachev Statements (Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 2 Jul 86; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 18 Jul 86) .....	25
Ottawa CITIZEN	25
Toronto GLOBE AND MAIL	26
East-West Arms Limitation Talks Viewed (Jan Reifenberg; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 5 Aug 86) .....	28
Soviet Commander in Poland on SDI, INF, Gorbachev Proposals (Aleksandr Kovtunov; Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI, 22-23 Feb 86)	30
Briefs	
Flexibility at Geneva Talks Sought	33
<b>INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES</b>	
Canada: Western Liberals Question Cruise Testing Policy (Joe O'Donnell; Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 14 Jul 86) .....	34
<b>CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS</b>	
USSR: U.S. Binary Weapons Deployment Decision Assailed (Various sources, various dates) .....	36
U.S. 'Chemical Rearmament' Continues, by M. Knyazkov	36
'Especially Dangerous for Europe', by Viktor Konnov	37



CSCE, Summit Accords 'Cast Aside', by Vitaliy Korionov	37
Foreign Ministry Briefing	39
Talks in CD Recalled, by Gennadiy Gerasimov	39
DPRK Paper Cited	40
Report on FRG's Genscher Soviet Press Agency Interview (Hamburg DPA, 28 Jul 86)	41
UK Tries To Break Impasse in Chemical Weapons Talks (London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 16 Jul 86; Edinburgh THE SCOTSMAN, 15 Jul 86)	42
Geneva Proposal, by David Adamson	42
Shevardnadze Reaction, by John Lichfield	43
Materials To Make Mustard Gas Easily Available in Netherlands (Frans van Klaveren; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 9 Jul 86)	44
<b>EUROPEAN CONFERENCES</b>	
USSR: W. European Lack of Response to Pact Proposals Hit (Various sources, various dates)	47
'Asymmetry' Claim Rebutted, by V. Vasin	47
West European 'Alarm', by Vladimir Katin	49
U.S. Pressure on Europe, Editorial	52
Soviet Envoys View CSCE, CDE, Vienna Follow-Up (Various sources, 31 Jul; 1 Aug 86)	55
Silin, Grinevskiy Comment	55
More From Grinevskiy	56
Tatarnikov on Confidence-Building	57
Moscow Press Conference	57
Soviet Report on CSCE Anniversary Helsinki Symposium (Igor Vladimirovich Kazey; Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR, No 6, Nov-Dec 86)	60
Moscow TV Cites Mexican CD Ambassador Robles on Lack of Progress (V. Dmitriyev; Moscow Television Service, 27 Jul 86)	66
USSR's Israelyan Criticizes American Stance at CD (Warsaw PAP, 31 Jul 86)	67
PRC Journal on Warsaw Pact Disarmament Proposal (Wu Jun; Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI, No 14, 16 Jul 86)	68
<b>NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS</b>	
Philippine Foreign Minister Announces ASEAN Nuclear-Free Stand (Various sources, various dates)	71
Conference Disclosure, by Chit Estella	71

ANZUS Issue 'Debate', by Antonio Kamiya	72
Laurel Reassures ASEAN on Nuclear Weapons	73
Retention of U.S. Bases Urged	74
South Pacific Forum Mistrusts Australian Free Zone Treaty (Peter Cole Adams; Melbourne THE AGE, 19 Jul 86) .....	75
Briefs	
South Pacific NFZ Treaty Signed	77
Kohl Supports Test Ban Appeal	77
RELATED ISSUES	
New Japanese Foreign Minister Stresses Peace, Disarmament (Tokyo KYODO, 23 Jul 86) .....	78
RSA's Bishop Tutu Invited to Hiroshima Peace Forum (Tokyo KYODO, 11 Jul 86) .....	80
RSA's Bishop Tutu, USSR's Bogdanov Speak After Japan Peace Meeting (Suvendrini Suguro; Tokyo KYODO, 5 Aug 86) .....	81
New Zealand: Lange, Shultz Discuss Nuclear Issue in Manila (Hong Kong AFP, 27 Jun 86) .....	83
Portuguese Gallup Poll on Disarmament, Dialogue (Lisbon SEMANARIO, 12 Jul 86) .....	85

/7310

JPRS-TAC-86-068  
22 August 1986

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: REAGAN'S COMMENTS SHOW NO COMPROMISE ON SDI

### Not 'Bargaining Chip'

OW021103 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1015 GMT 30 Jul 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] The American Administration is not about to reject attempts to speed up the star wars program. President Reagan announced this while speaking to students who are members of the Republican Party.

He specifically indicated that the United States had no intention to make this program a bargaining chip in the Soviet-American nuclear and space arms talks. We must continue the Strategic Defense Initiative program on schedule, Reagan stressed.

Contrary to the true state of affairs, the White House chief once again asserted that the star wars program is ostensibly a guarantee of peace without nuclear weapons, although specialists say that in addition to laser and other exotic weapons specified in the program, the most modern and even more dangerous nuclear arms will also be deployed in space. And although the SDI program is the main obstacle in the path of progress toward curbing the arms race, the President in his speech to the students has assured that the administration aspires to approach the talks with the Soviet Union conscientiously in order to achieve a reduction in arms. A strange form of conscientiousness, wouldn't you say?

### Deployment Planned

LD071146 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0955 GMT 7 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, 7 Aug (TASS) -- TASS observer on military matters Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

U.S. President Ronald Reagan, speaking to a group of proponents of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" -- representatives of right-wing conservative organizations -- has refuted the theory recently puffed up by the U.S. mass media that in his letter to the Soviet leader he supposedly proposed some sort of "compromise" -- refraining from SDI in exchange for strategic arms reduction. "When the time comes, and the development [razrabotka] of SDI is complete, we intend to deploy [razvernut] it," the President declared forthrightly.

As is known, understanding that because of the position of Washington, which does not want embark on a total ban on space-strike weapons, Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva have started down the road of fruitless discussions, the USSR proposed to the United States to reach agreement on partial measures that could be taken now, and each of which would make a weighty contribution to solving the task of preventing the militarization of space. First and foremost such measures would relate to an undertaking of the sides not to leave the ABM Treaty for a period of 15 years, with a strict observance of the restrictions it provides. However, as was written by THE NEW YORK TIMES and THE WASHINGTON POST, the head of the White House proposed a period of only 5 to 7 years. Moreover, the United States would continue research, testing and development [razrabotka] on the SDI program, and when the time limit runs out, irrespective of the outcome of the negotiations, would consider that it had the right to deploy [razvernut] an ABM system with space-based elements now banned by the ABM Treaty.

Thus, while giving up absolutely nothing, since during the course of a 7-year period the United States is technologically unable to commence the SDI deployment, and while continuing the development and testing of the ABM components, likewise banned by the treaty, the White House would like, at the same time, at this stage, also secure for itself the USSR's consent to the subsequent deployment of this system by the United States.

The representatives of the U.S. Administration attempted initially to portray this "firing of a blank" as some kind of a "compromise," a "far reaching step" by Washington. The propaganda hulabaloo confused even certain "hawks" in the United States. Now the President has put everything in its place. And it is because of this that the representatives of such widely known "hawk" organizations as the "High Frontier" "Heritage Foundation" and so forth, who have packed the hall, welcomed his statement with an ovation.

However, sober-minded U.S. politicians reacted in a completely different manner. "So long as President Reagan insists on moving forward to deployment of the "star wars" system, the chances of achieving any tangible agreement on arms control are equal to zero," stated Senator Edward Kennedy, for instance. Nor can one fail to agree with this. On my part, I would merely add: not just "tangible," but any kind of agreement altogether.

/9604  
CSO: 5200/1506

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### SOVIET ARMY PAPER REBUTS U.S. 'DEMAGOGUERY' ON SDI

FM051339 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Soldatenko article: "Washington's Mythical Panacea -- 'Star Wars' Champions' Demagogic Ploys Fail To Hold Water"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The basic theses increasingly imposed on everyone by those in favor of transferring the arms race to outer space amount to the following: SDI, they endeavor to persuade people, is a moral imperative. They allege that only this purely "defensive and nonnuclear" program serves in today's complex international situation the humane goal of primarily forcing the USSR to forsake its "aggressive designs" and sharply reduce its strategic forces and subsequently eliminate nuclear missiles on a world scale, so to speak, by turning them into "obsolete" and "useless" weapons. As far as the "star wars" program itself is directly concerned, it is today "purely in the research" phase and, far "from being part of an arms race, it does not constitute an armament, let alone a weapon."

However, in fact all this is sheer demagoguery. Even U.S. allies -- the sensible politicians in the British Parliament -- realize this. "The claims that the Soviet Union is planning to deliver a first strike against the United States are spread by people interested in slandering the USSR," Liberal member Gladwyn stressed in the House of Lords. These are the people who are encouraging the unprecedented rate of research and development [razrabotka] of more and more new weapons system, including space nuclear weapons, being carried out in the United States. Moreover, it is absolutely impossible to call such weapons "defensive" -- such definitions are inappropriate, R. Bowman, president of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, correctly states. Space-strike arms are intended to carry out combat operations in outer space. The sole true purpose of an ABM system with space-based elements conceived as part of SDI is to form an integral part of American offensive armaments intended to shield an aggressor launching a nuclear war against a counterstrike. This is acknowledged even by the American strategists themselves. "Unfortunately, the fact that the United States has begun implementing SDI," Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle lamented, "has given rise to the erroneous notion that it will form a vast canopy above the United States ... The essence of SDI, however, is to enable the United States to acquire the capability of intercepting Soviet missiles above the territory of the Soviet Union and of creating a canopy above the Soviet Union rather than above the United States."

Deploying armaments in outer space is a step that draws the world closer to nuclear catastrophe. "Star wars" will never rid mankind of nuclear weapons, just as the appearance of nuclear weapons themselves did not eliminate conventional weapons. The U.S. secretary of defense himself has has to admit this, saying that "the creation [sozdaniye] of a strategic defense has never envisaged the repudiation of nuclear strategy. In creating a strategic defense the United States does not intend to abandon nuclear deterrence but, on the contrary, intends to strengthen it even more."

We are not going to argue with Weinberger about that, since the "star wars" program has not and never has had any "defensive," let alone "humane goals," whereas the desire to provide the aggressor with the opportunity to deliver a nuclear strike with impunity is self-evident.

Nor, as the defenders of SDI try to assure the public, is the program "innocently nonnuclear." "Forget the demagogic statements claiming that the United States must conduct tests to ensure the effectiveness of its nuclear combat charges," THE NEW YORK TIMES points out.

The real reason for continuing the tests, which are smothered in a propaganda smokescreen, is the search for ways of creating [sozdaniye] new and more sophisticated kinds of weapons, such as nuclear-triggered lasers for the "star wars" program. It is for such "research" ["izyskaniya"] that billions of dollars are annually appropriated across the Atlantic. The total cost of just the space echelons of the American ABM system with space-based elements is, according to provisional estimates, around \$500 billion.

The "star wars" champions' claims that world stability requires first creating [sozdaniye] and deploying so-called "defensive" means and only subsequently engaging in reductions in strategic offensive armaments are also bare-faced demagoguery. However, neither side, in the opinion of Western experts, is capable of creating [sozdaniye] ultracomplex systems for intercepting ballistic missiles that are impenetrable and equal in terms of potential. "We proceed from the assumption," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "that there will be no malfunctions and that the defensive system will be perhaps 96 percent effective, as the High Frontier organization's report says. However, we cannot be too sure that the 4 percent of missiles that will nevertheless penetrate the defense will not be able to destroy our country as we know it." In other words, even given that the USSR and the United States possess identical ABM defense systems, the sides will have no certainty of complete safety. Each side will by all means seek to enhance the potential of its system for intercepting ballistic missiles and simultaneously improve its strategic offensive arms for the purpose of penetrating its enemy's similar interception system. The result is that the arms race will continue.

The "star wars" program is extremely dangerous not just because of, what one might call, its "end" result; the very "research" thrust of work within the SDI framework engenders deep anxiety. Well-known American specialists correctly maintain that the verbal smokescreen about the "defensive" nature of the research [izyskaniya] being carried out in the United States in breach of the 1972 U.S.-USSR treaty on the limitation of ABM systems is being used not only to develop and create [razrabotka i sozdaniye] a "nuclear shield" for American first-strike missiles but also and primarily to create and develop [razrabotka i sozdaniye] offensive space weapons. "The fairy tale that the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' is designed to eliminate nuclear weapons on earth -- as E. Teller, the fervent advocate and initiator of this reckless program, cynically admitted -- 'was dreamed up for U.S. internal consumption and to hit at the antiwar movement and get it to accept SDI.'"

You probably could not put it any more frankly than that.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1506



JPRS-TAC-86-068  
22 August 1986

USSR: JULY-AUGUST REPORTS ON U.S. SDI DEBATES

WALL STREET JOURNAL Cites Weinberger

LD231104 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT 23 Jul 86

[Text] New York, 23 Jul (TASS)--By TASS correspondent Maksim Knyazkov:

The WALL STREET JOURNAL has described the Reagan administration's "Star Wars" programme as rapidly developing. According to the newspaper's estimates, an unprecedented sum of \$3.8 billion would be spent in fiscal 1987 on its implementation.

The money would be used to develop the foundations of the partially space-based anti-ballistic missile system, set up within the framework of the "Strategic Defence Initiative," the newspaper reported.

Facts disclosed by the WALL STREET JOURNAL contradicted the White House's allegations that the ABM system would make nuclear weapons useless and obsolete. The newspaper quoted General James Abrahamson, head of the SDI organization, as saying that a nuclear explosion was the only source of energy for a whole number of lasers.

Thus, according to local analysts, the deployment of the "anti-missile shield" would mean, in fact, the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space.

The WALL STREET JOURNAL observed that many viewed the SDI as the second direction in the arms race--along with the buildup of offensive nuclear arms.

In a bid to attain global strategic superiority with the help of the "Star Wars" programme, Washington is stubbornly refusing to conduct talks with the USSR on preventing the militarization of outer space.

This was confirmed by U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger at a luncheon with selected journalists, the Pentagon chief made it clear that any agreement providing for renunciation of the SDI would be quite undesirable from any viewpoint.

Johns Hopkins Study on Cost

LD231617 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 23 Jul 86

[Text] Washington, 23 Jul (TASS)--The cost of building a "Star Wars" defense against nuclear missiles and operating it for 10 years would range from \$670 to 770 billion, according to a study issued here.

The study, by John Hopkins University, warned that such enormous expenditures would require either cuts in many social welfare programs or additions to the taxation burden equivalent to \$570 annual income tax increases for the average American family.

The Pentagon declined to comment on the conclusions. According to James Abrahamson, the man in charge of the SDI effort, the program was still too young to allow reasonable estimates.

Pentagon spokesman Robert Sims, however, bluntly declared at a news conference that they would press on with the effort, whatever the costs.

He also said the administration remained committed to plans for deploying an antisatellite (Asat) system.

These plans are known to be directly connected with the "Star Wars" program, which is part and parcel of U.S. first-nuclear-strike strategy.

Sims said the administration would keep pressing Congress to lift financial constraints on Asat tests in outer space.

Physicist Cited on Dangers

LD251034 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 25 Jul 86

[Text] Washington, 25 Jul (TASS)--By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

According to the Johns Hopkins University, the implementation of the "Strategic Defence Initiative," which provides for the deployment of arms and systems and power sources for them in outer space, will cost at least \$770 billion.

Administration officials asserted that no matter how much these systems might cost, the spending would be justified, since they were purportedly called upon to protect the United States and the rest of the world from nuclear catastrophe.

According to their assurances, the "Star Wars" programme would even make nuclear weapons "obsolete." In other words, they are trying hard to prove that the allocations to the Pentagon for the development of space arms were nothing but payment for survival.



That such allegations are as far from the truth as the stars are from the earth is evidenced by the information provided by well-known physicist Professor Ernest Sternglass of Pittsburgh State University.

In an article in the July issue of the bulletin of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the scientist recalled that the Pentagon was planning to deploy in outer space hundreds, even thousands of units of nuclear-powered-laser weapons.

As a result of a nuclear explosion in outer space, Sternglass said, at least half of radioactive particles generated would penetrate inside the earth's atmosphere, which was fraught with extremely dangerous consequences for life on the planet.

Large expanses of land would be subjected to intensive ultraviolet radiation, which would affect not only people, but also animal and plant life and water.

The scientist observed that Pentagon experts were planning to deploy nuclear reactors in outer space to power systems of "defensive" arms. Atomic reactors were unsafe even though on earth they were under constant bervation. This kind of monitoring would be extremely complicated in respect with space-based reactors.

In the event of an accident, a huge radioactive cloud would descend on earth. It would destroy the environment and people. Even at peacetime, the deployment of arms in outer space was fraught with disastrous consequences irrespective of whether such systems would be put into operation or not, Sternglass pointed out.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the scientist's remarks: billions of dollars spent by the Pentagon on the "Star Wars" programme is not payment for survival. That is payment for death.

#### U.S. Army Space Agency

LD011328 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 1 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow August 1. TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The U.S. Department of Defense has just announced the founding of a U.S. Army space agency which begins to function from today.

Thus, yet another substantial element has been added to the U.S. organisational structure which is designed for "star war" preparations.

The present U.S. Administration began to contribute to organisationally "streamlining" the management of the militarisation of outer space way back in 1982 when the United States President signed a directive on founding a new inter-departmental coordination body which was entrusted with drafting versions of decision on major space problems for the White House.

This was followed by the establishment of a space command of the Air Force, a space command of the Navy, a space command of the U.S. Armed Forces, and, this time, a U.S. Army space agency.

"Guardians of the high frontier" is the motto of the space command of the Air Force, which, according to the American AIR FORCE magazine, symbolises the importance of outer space to U.S. "national security" and reveals the ambition of the Air Force to dominate that environment.

The number of such "guardians" of the high frontier grows in the Pentagon with every passing year. At any moment they are prepared to phase into operational readiness the space strike weapons which are being developed by the U.S. military-industrial complex.

Moreover, the Pentagon's top brass increasingly often speak of the need to form a new independent armed service in the near future: a space military force which would function on a par with the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

The U.S. military-industrial complex has now unfolded a huge machinery which is designed to implement the "star wars" idea.

An organisational framework for the SDI programme has been set up, and the industry has been engaged.

Strategists are busy developing concepts for the conduct of combat operations in outer space, and operations involving the use of space-strike weapons.

The new organisational measures which have just been announced by the Pentagon are yet another evidence of still more increased preparations in the United States for "star wars" which pose danger to the very existence of civilization on earth.

#### Senate Vote on Funding

LD061526 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Aug 86

[Vladimir Pasko commentary]

[Text] It is reported from Washington that the Senate of the U.S. Congress has rejected, by 50 votes to 49, an amendment to draft legislation [as heard] on military allocations for the 1987 fiscal year that would provide for a considerable reduction in the expenditures requested by the White House for Reagan's star wars program. According to news agencies, the President and the defense secretary have undertaken an intensive campaign to win the legislators over to support the administration's requests. Here is commentator Vladimir Pasko:

At first glance, the 1-vote advantage of the government request for the implementation of the so-called SDI is evidence of serious opposition in Congress to the President's star wars program. I should not that a similar amendment, reducing the administration's request for this program, is presently being examined by the House of Representatives. The attitude of Americans toward the idea of the militarization of space is certainly making itself known in Congress. However, the fact remains that in spite of the opposition, allocations to the program continue to increase. Last year the legislators cut the request for SDI by \$900 million but the sum that remained was 3 times higher than the sum that was assigned to it 2 years earlier. An attempt is being made in Congress now to reduce the request for SDI by \$1.5 billion, but what remains exceeds the expenditures on SDI in the current year by 16 percent. No other program being implemented in the United States is receiving such an increase.

The inevitable question arises: How serious are the legislators in their opposition to the star wars program? Are they aware of its consequences? If one looks at what the legislators are talking about, for example, in the Senate Armed Services Committee, the answer is no. The point at issue in the sessions was above all the rate of development of the program, the effectiveness of the expenditures on it, and the program's efficiency. The political aspect was examined merely in terms of what pressure could be brought to bear on the Soviet Union through the program. In these conditions, it is no surprise that in the majority of cases the President and the defense secretary succeed in getting Congress on their side; there are no differences of opinion between them on important issues. In the forthcoming examination, the SDI debate in the highest legislative body in the United States has been called upon not to block but rather to guarantee the implementation of the star wars program and to force Americans to reconcile themselves to the thought that its implementation is inevitable.

#### Budget Debate

LD071419 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 7 Aug 86

[Excerpts] The United States Congress is concluding discussions on another military budget. Yuriy Solton comments:

When one reads American newspapers one gets the impression that a fierce battle is in progress between Congress and the administration. Charges and countercharges come forth as if from the horn of plenty. The charges of extravagance are countered with claims that the needs of defense are scorned. Some allocations get cut, others increased. This happens every year. In the meantime military spending keeps growing. In the next fiscal year it is to reach about \$320 billion. There is one reason for all this: Whatever legislators and administration officials say for the benefit of the public, they all serve to a varying extent one diety -- military industrial complex. The war business is voracious. Yesterday it wanted millions of dollars, today billions, and tomorrow it will require trillions. And it gets them. Recently President Reagan sent to Congress a report reaffirming his country's intention to stop observing its agreements on strategic-arms limitation signed with the Soviet Union. This signifies that military corporations will receive additional orders whose worth amounts to \$100 billion.

On Wednesday the 6th, the master of the White House announced that he would not give up his star wars program and that advanced weaponry would be deployed in space as soon as it was ready. And what is its cost? According to news reports, from \$670 to \$770 billion. Most of these funds will land in the safes of military corporations as their profits. [passage omitted]

Some might say that this is America's internal affair. No, it is not, because military corporations produce deadly weapons fraught with universal destruction, not toys. By spreading the myth about a Soviet military threat, military-industrial complex kindless world tensions and nudges the United States toward military adventures. The growing role of the militarist circles in forming America's foreign policy poses a threat to global peace.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1506

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: SDI 'BLATANT VIOLATION' OF ABM TREATY

PM061131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Aug 86 First Edition p 6

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences V. Vereshchetin, "Vice President of the International Institute of Space Law": "'Star Wars' is Against International Law"]

[Text] How do U.S. obligations as defined by international law correspond to its "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) aims and practical actions to realize these aims?

In order to answer this question, let us turn to the ABM Treaty, which is regarded everywhere as the cornerstone of the totality of international agreements on arms limitation and reduction. The special role of this unlimited-duration treaty is determined by the organic link between strategic offensive and defensive weapons.

As follows from the very title, preamble, and basic provisions of the treaty, its aim is the sides' maximum restraint in the creation of ABM system. The most important obligation under the treaty is "not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of the territory of its country and not to provide a base for such a defense" (Article I point 2).

The officially stated basic idea and ultimate aim of SDI are directly at variance with the aim of the ABM Treaty and also with the cited obligation under this treaty. In the U.S. presidential directive of 23 March 1983 which announced SDI its aim is defined as "elimination of the threat created by nuclear ballistic missiles." In the final analysis it is a question of an attempt to create an "ABM shield" protecting the entire U.S. territory, which is prohibited by Article I of the treaty.

In addition to the general ban on deploying [razvertyvaniye] ABM systems to defend the territory of an entire country and providing a base for such defense, the treaty and the 3 July 1974 protocol to it establish specific quantitative, qualitative, and geographical restrictions of ABM defenses. Thus, the sides agreed to have only one ABM system siting [razmeshcheniye] area each, with a set number of launch sites, ABM interceptor missiles at these launch sites, and so on.

The obligation "not to develop [sozdavat], test, or deploy ABM systems or components that are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based" (Article V) has exceptional significance among these specific restrictions. In blatant violation of this obligation, SDI is aimed at creating [sozdaniye] an ABM system with space-based elements.

The U.S. Administration attempts to prove that Article V presents no obstacle to working on the SDI program. First, they say because this program is supposedly confined only to certain preliminary stages in creating [sozdaniye] elements of a space-based system, and second, because these elements allegedly do not come under the concept of the system "components" mentioned in Article II of the treaty.

Serious legal analysis of the treaty shows the groundlessness of such attempts. Article V declares a ban not only on any "advanced" [prodvinutyy] stages in the creation of space-based systems and components but on their creation [sozdaniye] in general. And if we turn to the SDI program for the immediate future we will see that it envisages not just laboratory research, as U.S. officials claim, but also the development [razrabotka] and testing of key elements of the future system.

Consequently, it is a question not only of violating the ban on the creation [sozdaniye] of space-based systems and components but also of violating the ban on testing them. The word play Washington tries to conduct and the substitution of the term "test" with the term "demonstration" does not alter the essence of the matter.

The same applies to the use of the concepts "subcomponents," "devices," and so forth in official U.S. documents in place of the term system "components," the creation [sozdaniye] and testing of which are banned. It is evident that, by virtue of its basic task, the SDI program is aimed at seeking ways and means of creating [sozdaniye] a system banned by the treaty.

On the threshold of the Soviet-American Geneva summit meeting the most bellicose U.S. circles tried to push the Washington administration into a so-called "liberal" interpretation of the ABM treaty.

The "new reading" of the treaty and the history of its conclusion engendered a version according to which the development [razrabotka] and testing of ABM systems based on "new physical principles" and possibly also the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of such systems are supposedly not banned by the treaty. Only after, in the words of THE WASHINGTON POST, did the bombs of indignation begin to explode in Europe and in the U.S. Congress, The American Administration decided -- under pressure from the country's political opinion and its alarmed NATO allies -- for tactical reasons and as "practical policy" to adhere to the old interpretation of the treaty. However, in this respect, high-ranking American figures, including the U.S. President, the secretary of state, and P. Nitze, special adviser to the President and the secretary of state on arms control, made it clear that they reserve the right to return to the "new" interpretation at any time that is convenient from their viewpoint.

What are the claims to the possibility of a "broader" interpretation of the treaty based on? References are made to one of the agreed statements appended to the treaty when it was being signed -- the so-called statement "D". It is being interpreted as allegedly permitting the unlimited creation [sozdaniye] and virtually the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of ABM systems based on new physical principles (lasers, particle beams, and so forth). This interpretation is directly opposed to the meaning originally invested in the statement.

Supplementing Article III of the treaty, statement "D" does not rule out the possibility of ABM means based on new physical principles appearing in the future, but only coupled [privyazke] with the ABM areas and stationary, land-based systems permitted by the treaty -- not space-based or any other system. The deployment [razvertyvaniye] of new means in a permitted area can take place only after the consultations between the sides

on the limitation of those means and the agreement of corresponding amendments to the treaty. In other words, the point of statement "D" is to reinforce the treaty provisions banning the deployment [razvertvaniye] of any large-scale ABM systems and certainly not to nullify the prohibitions stipulated by Articles I and V as applied to ABM systems and components based on new physical principles. Statement "D" allows no other interpretation.

Not only has the Soviet side declared the inadmissibility of a "broad," "liberal" interpretation of the treaty, but so have American figures who took part in drawing up the ABM treaty, including G. Smith, head of the American delegation at the talks, and (Dzh. Raynlender), legal adviser to the delegation.

The "star wars" program not only undermines the Soviet-American ABM Treaty but also a number of multilateral treaties that form important foundations of contemporary law and order on earth and in space.

The treaty on principles governing the activities of states in the exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies (the 1967 Outer Space Treaty), which has been signed by more than 80 states, prohibits launching any objects with nuclear weapons or other types of mass destruction weapons into earth orbit. The initiators and executors of the SDI program love to argue that it is aimed at using nonnuclear defensive means, but at the same time they are engaged in the creation and testing of lasers fed by the energy from a nuclear explosion within the framework of this program. The siting [razmeshcheniye] of such explosive devices in space would violate Article IV of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Conducting test explosions in space to complete work [otrabotka] on nuclear-triggered lasers is also ruled out by the 1964 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space, and Under Water. This treaty has more than 100 signatory states in addition to the USSR and the United States.

The "star wars" program is no less dangerous for the fate of the 1968 Non Proliferation Treaty, which has been signed by the overwhelming majority of the world's states. The threat of the so-called "vertical" proliferation of nuclear weapons and their siting [razmeshcheniye] in space is the direct result of the "star wars" plans. The SDI program is clearly at variance with U.S. obligations stemming from other multilateral and bilateral treaties.

The principle of conscientious fulfillment of international obligations holds a special place among the basic principles of international law. Without observance of this principle the very existence of international law and the maintenance of orderly relations between states are inconceivable. This principle has been given international legal backing in a number of very important contemporary documents. In the Soviet Union it has been made constitutional.



Conscientious fulfillment of international treaties is a most important requirement stemming from this principle. The United States disregards this requirement of international law, blatantly violating the ABM Treaty and other treaties in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction by its practical actions.

In this connection the United States attempts to cast aspersions on the other side, accusing it of imaginary violations of arms limitation and reduction treaties while simultaneously preparing the ground for renouncing the ABM Treaty the moment it gets too much in the way of work on creating [sozdaniye] and deploying [razvertyvaniye] space-based strike weapons. U.S. military circles do not even hide this. "We must examine the possibility of really breaking with the ABM Treaty," Defense Secretary C. Weinberger says.

The SDI program also runs counter to one of the newest principles of international law and Soviet-American relations -- the principle of equality and identical security. This principle in USSR-U.S. relations acquired legal force with the signing of the 1972 document defining the basic principles of relations between the two countries. The principle of equal security has also been consolidated in other Soviet-American and multilateral treaties. Reliable security, equal for all states, which the Soviet Union strives to ensure with both persistency and initiative, as proclaimed from the 27th CPSU Congress rostrum, must be based on political solutions rather than on the creation [sozdaniye] of new military and technical means.

The SDI program has the aim of destroying the present strategic parity and creating one-sided advantages for the United States in the military sphere. Consequently it is incompatible with the principle of equality and identical security. The creation [sozdaniye] of space-based strike means will reinforce no one's security. It will merely increase distrust between countries and considerably lessen their security.

According to the official version put out by the U.S. President when proclaiming the SDI program, its function is to "render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete." But the Soviet Union has proposed an extremely simple, radical, and effective means of resolving this problem -- totally eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of the century.

It is obvious that the SDI program is a concentrated attempt to secure U.S. military and strategic superiority. It is a continuation of its international policy of acting from a position of strength, but not from the position of the law. It means a total disregard of U.S. international legal obligations and the interests of universal security to suit that policy.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1506



## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR'S ISRAELYAN ASSAILS SDI IN CD

10071244 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT 7 Aug 86

[Text] Geneva August 7 TASS -- "It is necessary to put emphasis on the lessons which mankind should draw from the tragedy of Hiroshima", Viktor Israelyan, the leader of the Soviet delegation at the Conference on Disarmament, said at the conference today. "It is absurd and simply criminal to follow old, long-dead, patterns in face of the nuclear threat. The time has come to consider the realities of the nuclear age and not to make policy on the basis of illusions and delusions by the yardsticks of the age that existed before August 9, 1945".

As an example of an outdated political thinking, the speaker mentioned the policy of the United States designed to raise artificial obstacles in the way of efforts to curb the arms race and achieve disarmament, specifically in the matter of preventing an arms race in outer space. Contrary to obvious facts the United States is trying to persuade the world that the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" is allegedly the only way to save mankind.

In contrast to the policy of "star wars", the Soviet Union puts forward an alternative of "star peace", i.e. exploration of outer space by the joint efforts of all states for peaceful purposes. In this connection the Soviet delegation presented a action programme set forth in the letter of June 12 addressed by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

Most of other participants in the Geneva conference set before themselves the aim of preventing an arms race in space. Lying on the table, next to the Soviet proposals, are concrete proposals from Sweden, Argentina, Sri Lanka, China and Australia. The recent meetings dealing with the need to take effective steps, were addressed by representatives of Indonesia, Poland, Romania, Venezuela, Czechoslovakia and other countries.

But progress on these matters, like on other problems of curbing the arms race and removing the nuclear threat, is being hampered by the policy pursued by the delegations of the USA and some of its allies.

Donald Lowitz, the leader of the American delegation, speaking at the latest meeting, tried again to present the Washington administration as something like an only advocate of peace and disarmament. Equally strange was his assertion that the bomb dropped on Hiroshima gave rise to thousands of hopes, "revolutionised" man's thinking, brought nearer the end of war and facilitated the establishment of the United Nations. Such an obvious reluctance not to reckon with historic facts and the sentiments of the world public caused confusion even in the circles of Western delegations.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1506

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV CONTRASTS SDI, EUROPEAN EUREKA PROJECT

LD061749 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 6 Aug 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vitaliy Ilyashenko]

[Text] The U.S. Senate has rejected an amendment to the bill on military allocations for the fiscal year 1987 by 50 votes to 49. The amendment provided for a considerable reduction in the expenditure requested by the White House for Reagan's star wars program. The amendment submitted by Democratic Senator Johnston provided for a reduction in budget allocations for the implementation of the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] from \$5.3 billion, as demanded by the administration, to 3.2 billion. The majority of just one vote gained by the champions of the plans to militarize space is evidence of the existence in the U.S. Congress of serious opposition to the star wars program, which democratic Senator John Kerry described as a cancer. The Washington administration is experiencing obvious difficulties in pushing through the plans for the defense initiative.

It is no surprise that the Pentagon brass hats have thought up an avoiding maneuver. They reckon to include their European partners in the search and development programs for SDI. As you know, a year ago, on the initiative of the French Government, 18 West European countries adopted the so-called Eureka project. They agreed on joint research in the field of advanced technology, in electronics, laser technology, information science, and so on. This program was put forward as an alternative to Reagan's SDI. It was a kind of response to the challenge thrown down to Western Europe in the field of modern technology by the United States, the chief rival and competitor.

The governments of the countries participating in Eureka came out in favor of a peaceful, civil character for scientific-technological cooperation. However, it has become clear over the last year that the West European military-industrial complex is trying to make use of the Eureka program to cover up military research and development. The Pentagon is energetically urging the West European companies along this path. What is more, General Rogers, commander of NATO armed forces, has openly spoken in favor of creating a European system of antimissile defense, a kind of European nuclear shield to supplement the U.S. SDI. The Pentagon is now farming out orders to European firms for the study and development of a European antimissile program. The aim is clear: to help Washington implement plans to create space weapons, and to harness the Europeans more firmly to their star wars programs. These plans have been exposed by Von Buelow, chairman of the SPD [Social Democratic Party of Germany] commission on security matters. In particular, he stated that the idea of creating an antimissile defense system in Western Europe is just as mistaken as the U.S. SDI. Both SDI and the European defense initiative, Von Buelow said, would lead to a sharp destabilization of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and to an increase in the threat of nuclear war.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1506

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### PRAVDA VIEW'S JAPAN'S POST-ELECTION SDI POLICY

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 86 p 5

[Text] Official circles in Tokyo decided to speed up the process of involving Japan with Washington's "Star Wars" program. This action, judging by everything, is one of the first consequences of the recent parliamentary elections, in which the Liberal Democrats succeeded in significantly crowding out all opposition parties except the Communists.

Only half a year ago Nakasone assured Reagan that he viewed the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) "with understanding". Yet for a long time Tokyo had decided not to openly associate with it. Participation in the creation of space-strike weapons is inconsistent with the constitution which states that the Japanese people for eternity refuse to use military force. It also contradicts three parliamentary resolutions: one on space research and the use of space for exclusively peaceful purposes, one on the refusal to produce, acquire, or distribute nuclear weapons, and one banning exportation of military equipment and technology.

If it had acted straightforwardly, the government could have lost many peoples votes. Therefore, until the election the Liberal Democrats painstakingly avoided the question of "Star Wars", making it appear as if the response to it was still being considered. Three exploratory groups of government experts and representatives of big business visited the U.S. In the corridors of power they talked about "quietly crawling into" SDI, that is, blessing participation in it by private firms without an official agreement between governments. However, after its success in the July elections, the ruling party, openly took the course toward full-scale association of Japan to the "Star Wars" program.

U.S. militarist circles want to convert Japan into an accomplice in the militarization of space for many reasons. Above all Washington is interested in the political support from Tokyo, in order to deflect the wave of protest in the allied countries. Once, supposedly, "even Japan, with her nuclear allergy, isn't shunning participation in SDI", can there be doubts in the "defensive character" of this program? Secondly, American creators of space weapons are intending to rely on the help of Japan's scientific-technological potential, in particular her achievements in the areas of electronics, laser technology, and fiber optics. Finally, across the ocean, they calculated that Japanese participation in SDI will cancel the "three non-nuclear principles" once and for all, which would allow the Pentagon to station communications, tracking, and guidance facilities on the Japanese territory for operations in space.

The facts, however, indicate that the course of the ruling circles on association with SDI severely aggravated the internal political situation in Japan. All the leading opposition parties spoke out against it . And judging by everything, it is precisely the confrontation on the present question which might further promote consolidation of the peace-loving democratic forces, whose lack of cohesion cost them dearly in the recent election.

CSO: 5200/1508

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPANESE SOURCES CITED ON PROSPECTS FOR SDI DECISION

OW161341 Tokyo KYODO in English 1136 GMT 16 Jul 86

[Text] Tokyo, July 16 KYODO -- The government is likely to decide on participation in research on U.S. President Ronald Reagan's space-based antimissile project, the strategic defense initiative, by the end of September, government sources said Wednesday. The prospect emerged after the government's decision to hold a third ministerial conference on the project, known as "star wars," on Friday.

The decision was made public by Chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda Wednesday. He said discussions at the conference will focus on such subjects as legal problems concerning protection of classified information and return of technology deriving from research work to Japan.

"The first diplomatic task to be tackled by the new cabinet will be the question of Japan's participation in the strategic defense initiative [SDI]," said one official source. Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone is scheduled to inaugurate his third cabinet soon after he is re-elected as prime minister by both houses of the (?diet). Government sources said another ministerial conference on SDI participation would be held soon after the new cabinet is formed.

In the two conferences held so far, the government has taken a positive approach toward Japan's participation in SDI research on the grounds it would contribute to improvement of technological standards and conform to Japan's policy of national security based on self-defense. The government also contended that Japan's participation in SDI research work would help promote the effective operation of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

While private enterprises will be allowed to take part in the development of nonmilitary technology, government officials will be able to work in the field of military technology under the existing arrangement for transfer of technology for use for military purposes, the sources said.

Nakasone expressed his personal "understanding" of Reagan's project when the two leaders met in the United States in January 1985. It is almost certain that a decision will be made before Nakasone's second two-year term as president of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party expires at the end of October, the sources said.

/9738

CSO: 5260/111

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

JAPANESE MINISTERS MOVE TOWARD 'WEST GERMAN' SDI FORMULA

OW180416 Tokyo KYODO in English 0406 GMT 18 Jul 86

[Text] Tokyo July 18 KYODO -- Key cabinet ministers whose responsibilities include fields which would be covered by research on the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) virtually agreed Friday on Japan's participation in the research. Officials said the six cabinet ministers, including Chief Cabinet Secretary Masaharu Gotoda, held a third meeting on the matter at which they "virtually confirmed" Japan's move toward taking part in research on the space-based antimissile system -- the so-called "star wars" project -- on the basis of what is described as "West German" formula. Under the formula, private enterprises will chiefly take part in the research but the government will not fund their participation.

Japan will try to work out an agreement with the United States on ways that will allow the Japanese private sector to join in the research while ensuring the return to Japan of derivative technology developed in the course of the research.

The cabinet ministers did not make a formal decision Friday and instead left it for their successors to decide. Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone is expected to form a new cabinet next week following the landslide victory of his ruling Liberal-Democratic Party in the July 6 parliamentary elections.

The six ministers meeting Friday also agreed that the government will not propose new legislation to protect classified information on military technology, that private enterprises will mostly take part in the U.S. research although a way will be retained for government-related agencies to participate in it, and that the government will not contribute any financial expenditure on it.

/9738

CSO: 5260/112

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

FRG'S FDP OFFICIAL CRITICIZES REAGAN SDI STATEMENT

LD071330 Hamburg DPA in German 1151 GMT 7 Aug 86

[Text] Bonn, 7 Aug (DPA) — Olaf Feldmann, the disarmament expert of the FDP Bundestag group, has criticized as "damaging for the alliance" the repeated refusal of U.S. President Ronald Reagan to make the SDI program available in negotiations with Moscow. Feldmann said in Bonn on Thursday that with his statement on Wednesday that he would implement SDI in any event after concrete research results were available, regardless of possible concessions from the Soviet Union in disarmament policy, Reagan had given an abrupt rejection to the hopes for a negotiated solution between East and West.

Especially with a view to a new summit meeting between Reagan and Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev, the U.S. President's statement was incomprehensible, because it took away from Moscow any incentive for concessions in disarmament policy. The European governments would be well advised not to leave the U.S. President's statement uncontradicted.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2735

22 August 1986

## U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

## USSR'S PETROVSKIY ON REAGAN NST LETTER, TEST BAN, SALT

LD032013 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1730 GMT 3 Aug 86

[Interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, by correspondent Alajos Chrudinak, "this week"; place not given; Petrovskiy remarks in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation; no video available--recorded]

[Excerpt] [Chrudinak] Comrade Gorbachev said in Vladivostok at the beginning of the week that the latest letter of reply which President Reagan has sent him is thought-provoking. Do you personally know anything about the content of this letter?

[Petrovskiy] I would first and foremost draw your attention to what Comrade Gorbachev said there. In fact his reaction precisely reflects the new foreign political style which can be seen in our country now. Therefore, we ourselves receive these proposals as seriously as possible, these indications which come to us from Washington. And if we see anything that testifies to their realism, which might promote the two countries' agreement, then we welcome it. You ask whether I am acquainted with the letter's content; unfortunately all I can say is that I left Moscow just at the moment when this letter arrived.

[Chrudinak] Is it conceivable that this letter of reply is just some kind of diplomatic nicety? Or is it perhaps something more serious?

[Petrovskiy] Comrade Gorbachev said in this connection: We have received Reagan's letter, his message, in which he replies to the initiatives which the Soviet Union made in June this year. Reagan's counterproposals, however, do not as yet deal seriously with the fundamental issues connected with security between our countries, first and foremost with stopping the arms race on earth and preventing its extension into space.

But we shall study these proposals as attentively as possible. And as Comrade Gorbachev also mentioned, we wish to set only a single national standard in judging these proposals, the standard of equal security, the standard of whether these proposals accord with the objectives which figure on the agenda of world politics.



[Chrudinak] In my opinion, however, matters do not by any means look as good as this. In a few days, on 6 August, the unilateral moratorium is to expire -- in the terms of which the Soviet Union has so far not carried out any nuclear tests. But Washington has offered no reaction to this whatever. In our opinion, what will happen after this date?

[Petrovskiy] Look, I do not want to evade the answer now, but you must understand that for me to be able to answer this question I would have to know what the other side now wants. We have now extended this moratorium three times. Why? We made no secret of it and do not hide the fact now wither that, to be sure, this moratorium was not an easy decision either from the military or from the economic point of view, when the other nuclear powers are continuing their own nuclear-weapons testing. The U.S. side has so far replied to our moratorium only with the Nevada nuclear explosions. But if they do follow our example after all, then a completely new situation could come about. In this case, however, and I can tell you this, we cannot extend the moratorium ad infinitum.

[Chrudinak] On 27 May President Reagan announced that in future he will not adhere to SALT I, and especially not to SALT II, what happens if President Reagan actually violates these treaties?

[Petrovskiy] If this does happen, after all, then he will inflict a very severe blow on the entire system of international security. First of all, this will lead to a new, perilous, phase of the arms race. In these treaties, we established that the strategic, offensive and defensive weapons are very much connected with one another. Second, this step undermines the existing system of international agreements.

[Chrudinak] So you have not received a secret offer from President Reagan? For in fact he stressed his desire for agreement on a much better, more comprehensive, disarmament agreement than SALT.

[Petrovskiy] I beg your pardon! Reagan does not want any kind of agreement whatever. Rather, he wants to demolish the existing ones. All our other proposals, made in the interests of agreement, are lying there on the negotiating table. Our new style, our new way of thinking, naturally presupposes compromise. There is no agreement without compromise. But, you know, compromise is like applause in the theater, you can only applaud with two hands, two hands have to be clapped together. You cannot achieve a compromise with one hand. There is a need for a movement toward each other. We strive for rational compromise, a compromise that accords with the equal and reciprocal security of the Soviet Union, the United States and their allies alike. Without compromise not a single issue can be resolved.

/9604  
CSO: 5200/1504

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

FRG PAPERS COMMENT ON REAGAN LETTER TO GORBACHEV

DW281230 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 28 Jul 86

[From the Press Review]

[Excerpts] The main issue today is the disarmament dialogue between East and West.

*Die Welt* writes about the exchange of notes between Washington and Moscow: After a period of 1 month, President Reagan has responded to a letter from Mikhail Gorbachev in which he made far-reaching arms control offers to the United States. In doing so, the President is trying to regain some of the initiative Gorbachev took in a series of statements, speeches, letters and moratoriums, almost flooding the West with disarmament proposals before it could recover from the earlier offers. The Disarmament game has developed into a competition on two levels. Gorbachev has made offers that sound pleasant to the man in the street in the West — and certainly also in the East — who expect more security to come from disarmament. On the other hand, however, Gorbachev's proposals showed, after brief scrutiny by Western authorities, that their purpose was to curtain Western deterrence without offering real concessions. Reagan has now made an equally calculated countermove, saying that the United States is prepared to guarantee the ABM Treaty up to 1993. That would safeguard further SDI financing, notes the newspaper.

*Sueddeutsche Zeitung* writes: Following Gorbachev, Reagan has now stressed his interest in a summit meeting in the near future. His response to the Soviet party chief's disarmament proposals is an opening move that is primarily of political significance. Preparation for the summit meeting is to be facilitated. Talks are already taking place between the foreign ministries. Moscow has forgotten its upset over the U.S. raid on Libya. Gorbachev shows great interest in continuing talks with Reagan. If he wants to make the ailing Soviet system more efficient, he must revoke the policy of his predecessors, who wanted missiles instead of bread, and he must seek foreign policy detente. That is the only explanation of why Gorbachev has given up the basic Soviet opposition to the U.S. SDI program, suggesting in his latest proposal the continuation of the ABM Treaty for 15-20 years. [passage omitted]

*Augsburger Allgemeine* says that the next round of the East-West armament poker game promises to be interesting. The newspaper continues: The U.S. President has put the first card on the table. His new proposals can get the disarmament debate going again, a debate that was stuck for months because of SDI. Now it is up to the Soviet party chief to make a move. However, wishful thinking is out of place. The SDI project is not shelved at all, as some optimists may hope. Reagan is holding on to his pet project, but now he seems willing to compromise — starting with modalities — such as about the beginning of deployment.

*Koelnische Rundschau* maintains: The Soviets do not care for what reasons the SDI project is being delayed. They have fallen behind in that area, and they will try by all possible means to catch up with the Americans some day. The fact that they are prepared to agree to a continuation of the U.S. SDI research work is nothing but an admission that they themselves are intensely involved in that kind of research, explains the newspaper. [passage omitted]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2735

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

CANADIAN EDITORIALS DISCUSS REAGAN, GORBACHEV STATEMENTS

Ottawa CITIZEN

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 2 Jul 86 p A8

[Text]

President Reagan's May 27 warning about possible future non-compliance with SALT II may have had the desired effect. The Soviets now want to talk about it. Washington should promptly agree.

Just prior to the NATO ministerial meeting in Halifax, the U.S. leader blew hot and cold about continued U.S. compliance with the treaty. He said his country would continue to observe it this summer but not at the end of the year.

The crux of the Reagan statement was that SALT II was "fundamentally flawed" and was "judged by many to be inimical to genuine arms control, to the security interests of the U.S. and its allies, and to global stability."

Many of America's allies readily agree that SALT II isn't that great a treaty. But in the absence of anything better, Canada joined all other NATO states in urging the U.S. to stay with it so that the Soviets would do likewise — however imperfectly.

The abandonment of such a restraint regime would leave the superpowers free to increase their nuclear stockpiles almost at will — a frightening possibility.

Reagan explained that in future the U.S. would base its decisions regarding its strategic force structure on the nature and magnitude of the threat posed by Soviet strategic forces "and not on standards contained... in a flawed SALT II treaty which was never ratified, would have expired if it had been

ratified, and has been violated by the Soviet Union."

Reagan's statement was directly aimed at Moscow. It seems to have reached its target. Washington will abandon SALT II at the end of this year unless, Reagan hinted, the Soviet Union uses the intervening months "to take the constructive steps necessary to alter the current situation."

The last few days have brought two separate Soviet responses which, taken together, are encouraging. First, Mikhail Gorbachev wrote to Reagan offering a compromise proposal on the reduction of medium-range missiles in Europe and elsewhere. This could be the breakthrough that the Geneva arms negotiators have been waiting for. It could also break the logjam in the way of a superpower summit later this year.

In addition, the Soviets now want a special meeting of the U.S.-Soviet Standing Consultative Commission to consider the Reagan stand on SALT II. Any such discussion could naturally deal with what Reagan said he really seeks — an interim framework of truly mutual restraint. And tied to that could be deep strategic arms reductions — the president's top priority.

There's still a long way to go. But every opportunity for serious superpower negotiation must be used. For the U.S. not to do so would be irresponsible, contrary to the wishes of all its allies and against its own best interests.

Toronto GLOBE AND MAIL

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 18 Jul 86 p A6

[Text] The arms control landscape is now littered with proposals and counter-proposals, not to mention itinerant interlocutors such as French President François Mitterrand and former U.S. president Richard Nixon, who have both visited Moscow.

Can these various superpower proposals, so recently launched and orbited, survive re-entry? Possibly. U.S. President Ronald Reagan said last May that the United States would not continue to be bound by the SALT II treaty and expected to exceed its

limits later this year. Lately, however, the President has indicated that no decision has been made on whether to arm the now-famous 131st B-52 bomber with cruise missiles and thereby violate the treaty. Genuine Soviet interest in missile reductions, as well as heat from U.S. allies, Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appears to have given the President pause.

The Soviet Union has imposed a 12-month moratorium on its underground nuclear tests that is due to expire on Aug. 6. But

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said Tuesday that Moscow may extend the ban, depending on American positions on arms control issues. The Soviet side has apparently been heartened by a U.S. readiness to discuss — next month in Geneva — points of dispute on how nuclear tests can be verified.

Certainly, windows of opportunity exist for a strategic arms accord and for a comprehensive ban on nuclear warhead tests. But, equally, each superpower may still calibrate its proposals with a touch too much self-interest to meet the minimum requirements of the other side.

The United States, for example, reportedly may propose a reduction in the number of underground nuclear tests simultaneously with cuts in the number of strategic weapons on both sides. Besides the fact that there is no direct correlation between the number of weapons each side has and the number of tests they need to conduct, this equation overlooks the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), which is incompatible with both halves.

Should the U.S. proceed inexorably with its plans for a space-based anti-missile defence, the Soviet Union would require more nuclear missiles, not fewer, if it wished to preserve the credibility of its nuclear deterrent. That is why the most recent Soviet proposal to cut strategic weapons calls for a reduction to 8,000 warheads in each side's armory,

coupled with a U.S. pledge to adhere to the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty for 15 years and limit its SDI program to research.

Just as an all-out commitment to SDI is an impediment to a reduction in missile inventories, it also blocks progress on a comprehensive nuclear test ban. One of the main reasons the Reagan Administration has shied away from a nuclear test moratorium is that the nuclear-powered X-ray lasers which it has in mind for anti-missile defence would be a casualty of such a ban.

A pullback from SDI development is, therefore, the nexus between a test ban and a new strategic arms treaty. Neither is likely unless Mr. Reagan is prepared to defer "Star Wars." But as French officials said after Mr. Mitterrand's recent visit to the United States, the American President has a "near metaphysical" attachment to SDI.

Equally sobering is the Soviet leadership's intimation that a second Gorbachev-Reagan summit will not be scheduled without some accord on arms. It used to be Mr. Reagan who took the line that there was no point to a summit without solid headway in advance. Now the tables are turned, and Mr. Gorbachev is the one who appears set to hold out for achievements rather than atmospherics. On the arms control landscape, Mr. Gorbachev has moved adroitly to occupy the high ground.

/13104

CSO: 5220/49

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

EAST-WEST ARMS LIMITATION TALKS VIEWED

DW061141 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 5 Aug 86 p 6

[Editorial by Jan Reifenberg: "Ideology Hindering the Experts"]

[Text] Geneva, 1 Aug — The various Geneva arms limitation negotiations have been postponed for 4 weeks. The debate conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union for months and partly in public on the content of proposals, which could be topics at a productive second summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev, is now followed by silence. To begin with, it should be noted that a substantial change has taken place in that Moscow for months has been the petitioner and it has been up to the Americans to respond.

When experts in Geneva, at NATO headquarters in Brussels, and in allied capitals analyze Gorbachev's attitude since January, they arrive at the conclusion that even though he wants to meet Reagan again, he can only do so if he can credibly prove to the Soviet military leadership that an accord with Washington will not threaten his country's overall security. They also say that Gorbachev will continue to try to prevent the U.S. space-based defense project, because he suspects that the Soviet Union could lag technologically behind for many years to come. Therefore, analysts say, all Soviet proposals contain an attempt to pin the United States down to a clearly limited form of SDI research and at the same time secure for itself a maximum leeway of action.

"The ball is now in the Soviet court," Reagan said last week in his second cautiously optimistic address to Moscow, in which he again conceded to Gorbachev that he was taking a serious approach to the main issue of a reduction of mutual nuclear weapons stockpiles. It is true, in his reply letter to Gorbachev, Reagan responds to the Soviet desire for an extension of the ABM Treaty on limiting antiballistic missile systems. But he links it to the condition that after 7 years Moscow will have to agree to the deployment of at least a partial defense system in space. There can be no doubt that Reagan, irrespective of the warnings from many Atlantic partners, wants to drop the restrictive provisions of the ABM Treaty. That is the only way to do research and carry out the necessary tests, he thinks, which will allow a future

president — by 1994 — to decide whether technical progress really justifies replacing an existing strategy of deterrence with a new defense strategy.

It is still unclear what the Soviet Union means by "admissible laboratory tests of defense systems space components," and whether it would concede to the United States the further development of laser beams capable of hitting enemy missiles in their approach phase, a development which is only possible by conducting underground nuclear explosions of at least 20 kilotons of explosives. Lately, Reagan has said that he does not want to "negotiate SDI under the table" and that SDI research is "promising." That differs from his previous statements. However, the same president who "wants to respond to Soviet concerns and looks for areas of agreement," fails to say in his letter to Gorbachev how that is to be done. He insists on the ambiguity, which has always been part of the mutual attempts to extend weapons limitations.

According to results of opinion polls conducted in the United States, where a majority advocates the preservation of a strong defense and at the same time supports continuing negotiations with the Soviet Union, Reagan is heading for a second summit, experts believe, at which the United States should give up less than the Soviet Union. In addition, there is still no agreement among the President's numerous advisers on the extent of tolerable concessions in Geneva, Stockholm, or Vienna. Instead, the controversy between Pentagon and civilian authorities in Washington continues. Secretary of Defense Weinberger and his adviser Richard Perle remain unwilling to make the slightest concession to Moscow. Their open skepticism about arms limitation is shared by the head of the Disarmament Agency, Kenneth Adelman. The tug-of-war with Secretary of State Shultz and those on the National Security Council who support acceptable concessions is continuing as ever.

The Geneva chief negotiators on both sides frequently have to spend much more energy and time on negotiations with suspicious politicians and military of their own country than with their opposite numbers at the negotiating table. Only future historians will find out how many opportunities were missed in this way and how ideologies hindered experts who had long before realized the necessity of compromise.

Thus the extraordinary meeting of the so-called Standing Consultative Commission (SCC) on existing treaties between Washington and Moscow ended after less than a week without results and with mutual recriminations. The sides reproached each other with a number of real or suspected violations of the two SALT agreements and the ABM Treaty. Taking the Pentagon's view, Reagan insisted on his determination to discontinue observance of the numerical ceilings of the SALT agreement, which was never ratified and is expired anyway, if the Soviet Union's conduct justifies it. The President wants to replace SALT by "new forms of genuine arms limitation." The Russians threatened the "most serious consequences" in Geneva if the United States were to abandon the framework defined by

Brezhnev and Carter in 1979. Once again it was clear that the allies' misgivings constitute no guideline for strategic decisions in Washington.

However, the failure of the SCC extraordinary meeting in Geneva is just part of a poker game for the second summit, which will be continued at least until 19 September when the two foreign ministers George Shultz and Eduard Shevardnadze, meet in Washington. The same applies to the bilateral talks on the nuclear test ban, to be continued in Geneva in September, where Washington wants to secure for itself some latitude for continuing SDI research and perfecting its new strategic weapons, whereas Moscow so far insists on a general test ban treaty.

In Bonn in particular, people hope that what in a popular formula has been called "the great compromise" will materialize: limitation of SDI research and extension of the ABM Treaty in exchange for an initial reduction of strategic offensive weapons. In a resolution the U.S. House of Representatives demands that Reagan continue to observe the upper ceilings of SALT II, respect the "killer" satellite test ban, reduce the means for SDI to the proportions of the 1986 budget, and order a 1-year moratorium on all nuclear tests of more than 1 kiloton of explosive power. However, the representatives who want that are considered by Pentagon ideologists as opponents of security just like those "Europeans with weak knees" who are thoroughly despised there. So far nothing suggests that the President who always lets other people settle their differences before he makes a decision, will rather listen to the "doves."

The Europeans fail to see in their wishful thinking that no U.S. President can present a draft agreement, unless he has the military's approval. Only one-third of the votes in the Senate are necessary to prevent ratification. At least 34 senators of both parties will always represent the views prevailing in Pentagon. The chief negotiators in Geneva are constantly watched by representatives who are present for the Pentagon, the intelligence community, the chiefs of staff, and the State Department. Lone actions such as the "walk in the woods" of Paul Nitze and Yuliy Kvitsinskiy are only possible if Washington fully backs them. It is naive to believe that a NATO partner could exert a decisive influence.

It is true, according to Western experts, Gorbachev has brought the military under political control. The military are no longer represented in the Politburo as full-fledged members. However, 7.5 percent of all CPSU Central Committee members are military. No one on the Western side knows to what extent the Soviet military leadership will continue to have a say in arms limitation proposals and what consequences that will have for the upcoming "summit." In view of that limitation of both leaders' political power to assert themselves, it is all the more necessary for us to differentiate between the good-sounding proposals with which the public has been inundated and the hard realities which alone will ultimately determine whether the dialogue will lead to success. As matters stand, that success can only be limited. Too high expectations would be bound to lead to disappointment.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2735



## U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

### SOVIET COMMANDER IN POLAND ON SDI, INF, GORBACHEV PROPOSALS

AU122021 Warsaw ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI in Polish 22-23 Feb 86 p 2

[Speech by Colonel General Aleksandr Kovtunov, commander of the Norther Group of the Soviet Armed Forces, at concert held at the Polish Theater in Warsaw on 21 February to mark the 68th anniversary of the formation of the Soviet Armed Forces]

[Excerpts] The 68th anniversary of the Soviet Army and the Soviet Navy is being celebrated at a time when the achievements of the last 5 years are being discussed in the CPSU throughout our country, and when discussion of pre-congress documents is still in progress. These documents set out future tasks and prospects for the development of Soviet society.

Our achievements are significant. But life continually places new [and] higher demands on the work of all citizens and all Soviet society. And that is why the Communist Party will go to the 27th Congress with documents of great political importance: The draft new edition of the CPSU program, changes to the party statute, and the main lines of economic and social development for the 12th 5-year period and the period leading up to the year 2000. These documents contain party program goals, key issues relating to party economic strategy, and set out forms and methods of working with the masses at the present stage of development and in the future.

While improving itself domestically, our nation takes account of the complex, strained, and tense state of the international situation. It understands that the contemporary world is reaching a point which, if exceeded, can result in a course of events being beyond our control. This is the direct consequence of imperialism's aggressive policy, which is first and foremost the policy of reactionary circles in the United States of America, who are increasing and improving the strategic means of attack. At the same time, they are forcing the "star wars" program to go ahead. Realization of this program will mean the transferal of the arms race to space. American imperialism has declared numerous regions of the world and even entire continents to be "spheres of vital interests" for the United States. It has accorded itself the right to hinder the peaceful and just resolution of conflicts in various regions of the world and the right to conduct undeclared wars and to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states. This is the case with U.S. policy toward Poland.



The United States is being accompanied by its allies along this path leading to the threat of war. The governments of many Western European countries have disregarded national security and have deployed American first-strike weapons on their territory. Taking such decisions these governments have placed upon themselves a great responsibility for the fate of Europe and world peace. Neither can one nowadays ignore the increased activity of revanchist forces in the FRG, where certain circles are openly calling for a new "march to the East." While fully subordinating themselves to the United States, they are also trying to gain access to nuclear weapons and other contemporary instruments of warfare.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries believe that it is possible to return to disarmament, mutual trust, and cooperation despite the tensions that exist. For this to be achieved there must be an end to the conduct of policy from a position of strength and a return to observance of the norms of international law.

The removal of the threat of nuclear war hanging over us and the complete liberation of the planet from deadly nuclear weapons is an essential condition for securing a peaceful future for the peoples of Europe. The policy of the CPSU is directed at achieving this goal. Clear confirmation of this position was provided by the speech delivered by M. S. Gorbachev, CPSU general secretary, on 15 January this year, in which he said: "We want 1986 to be more than just a year of peace, we want it to make it possible to end the 20th century under the banner of peace and nuclear disarmament..., so that mankind will be able to greet the year 2000 under a peaceful sky, so that it will not know fear of destruction by nuclear, chemical, or other means, so that it will be deeply convinced of the possibility of its own survival and the preservation of the human race."

We know that the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives have generated great interest and have won general support among you in the PPR. This is attested to by the speeches made by representatives of the leadership of your country, by many articles in the press, and by the results of many meetings between our generals and officers, and representatives of party and state organs, and social organizations, and meetings with troops of the Polish Army and the youth of fraternal Poland.

I believe that Army General Wojciech Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary and chairman of the State Council, expressed the universal conviction of the entire peace-loving Polish nation with regard to the Soviet proposals when he described X.S. Gorbachev's proposals as: "Being, in its essence, of historic significance and providing a real prospect of an integrated disarmament program before the end of the century."

However, although almost a month has elapsed since M.S. Gorbachev's declaration was published in the press, a constructive reply from across the ocean has not been heard so far. Speeches made by various political, state, and army activists in the West contain notions such as "unrealistic" or "unacceptable" in relation to the Soviet peace initiatives, and talk of the supposed unilateral advantages which the Soviet Union and the Warsaw pact are to gain from their implementation. Moreover, the United States is continuing to implement its

"star wars" program, to develop new weapons, and to display its strength during maneuvers close to the borders of countries which are members of the socialist community.

Under these conditions, the Soviet Union and its allies are conducting an active struggle for peace and for an improvement in the international situation. The socialist countries are aware of the aggressive character of imperialism's preparations for war and are strengthening their unity and cohesion, expanding mutual aid and support, displaying a high degree of vigilance, and taking concrete steps to maintain a continual and high level of combat readiness.

The Communist Party and the Soviet people are making all possible efforts to ensure that the Soviet Armed Forces are in a position which does not allow imperialism to have strategic superiority over them, and are taking steps to comprehensively improve the defense capacity of the Fatherland. The Armed Forces of the fraternal socialist countries stand arm-in-arm with the Soviet Army in guarding socialist achievements. The might, cohesion, and constant high level of combat readiness of the armies of the Warsaw Pact member states guarantees that no supporters of military adventures will manage to surprise us, and that every potential aggressor must reckon with a decisive response on our part.

The 68th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy is being celebrated by the Soviet people and the soldiers of the Armed Forces in a mood of political enthusiasm and enthusiasm for work generated by the preparations for the highest forum of Soviet communists--the 27th CPSU Congress.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1504

U.S.-USSR NUCLEAR AND SPACE ARMS TALKS

BRIEFS

FLEXIBILITY AT GENEVA TALKS SOUGHT--Bonn, 28 Jul (DPA)--On Monday, the Federal Government once again welcomed Reagan's response to Gorbachev. It hoped that the U.S. President's letter would introduce a phase in the Geneva negotiations that would lead to a substantial result in the way of flexible give and take," said Norbert Schaefer, the government spokesman. He pointed out that consultations by the United States with the Federal Government and other alliance partners had preceded the letter from Reagan, the text of which is still not in hand in Bonn. [Excerpt] [Hamburg DPA in German 1326 GMT 28 Jul 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2735

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

CANADA: WESTERN LIBERALS QUESTION CRUISE TESTING POLICY

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 14 Jul 86 pp A1, A8

[Article by Joe O'Donnell]

[Text] CALGARY — Liberals in the West have called for a fresh debate on cruise missile tests as a way of protesting a decision by the United States to violate arms control agreements with the Soviet Union.

Also at their weekend policy conference, the western Liberals urged the party to "pursue an active commitment to arms control" and to adopt a more independent strategic defence policy, "especially as it applies to the North."

Liberal MP Lloyd Axworthy, who made the proposal, told the 200 delegates that when the Liberal government approved cruise tests over Canadian soil in 1983, it was with the understanding that the U.S. would uphold its end of the two nuclear arms control agreements between the superpowers: SALT II and the Anti-Ballistic Missile pact, signed in the early 1970s.

The U.S., which has carried out several cruise missile tests in Canada's north, plans six more next winter.

Despite frequent attacks on Prime Minister Brian Mulroney for his close ties with the U.S. administration Liberal leader John Turner has been cautious in questioning of the government's approach to the tests. The tests were first approved by the Liberals under Pierre Trudeau.

This is the second time in recent

months that a regional Liberal meeting has questioned Trudeau's agreement to allow cruise testing.

At a policy meeting of the Ontario wing of the federal party in March, delegates approved a resolution calling for an immediate halt to cruise tests over Canada. That resolution will be debated at the Liberals' national conference in November.

The resolutions, if adopted by the entire party at the national policy conference, would represent a major shift for the Liberals.

Axworthy has been an outspoken opponent of the tests ever since the agreement was signed.

"We made it clear that we would not allow our testing of the cruise to, in any way, impair our commitments on arms control agreements," he said.

"But we have reached a point where our obligations under the agreements have been disrupted. And that offers us the same opportunity to reply. And I think we now have the right to do that."

He said the mere production of cruise missiles shows that the Americans are abandoning SALT II because it represents a fresh nuclear arms buildup, which the treaty was supposed to eliminate.

"We're saying that our commit-

ment to the arms control agreements takes precedence over our agreement to continue the testing of the cruise," Axworthy said.

The western delegates, representing the 80 federal ridings from four provinces and the two northern territories, also urged the federal party to:

- ☐ Reaffirm its commitment to preserve all social programs in any new trade agreement with the United States;

- ☐ Commit itself to a more "humane" policy on refugees.

/13104

CSO: 5220/48

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. BINARY WEAPONS DEPLOYMENT DECISION ASSAILED

U.S. 'Chemical Rearmament' Continues

PM011126 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jul 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS correspondent M. Knyazkov report for IZVESTIYA: "An Ominous Step"]

[Text] New York -- President Reagan has officially informed the U.S. Congress of his decision to go ahead with the large-scale production of a new nerve gas chemical weapon, so-called binary munitions. According to an announcement by a White House spokesman, the Pentagon and the NATO Armed Forces Command in Europe have been instructed to draw up plans for the deployment of these munitions in West European countries "in appropriate circumstances." As has become customary, the President accompanied his latest militarist step with assurances that the United States allegedly "continue to favor a general ban on chemical weapons."

It cannot be claimed that the administration's present decision comes as a surprise. Ignoring worldwide protests, Washington has been preparing for this step for a number of years. In the small city of Pine Bluff, Arkansas a huge complex for the production of binary shells and bombs has been created and test sites have been modernized. At that level, appropriations in excess of \$1 billion have been requested from Congress for fiscal 1986 for the "chemical rearmament" of America.

However, the binary munitions for whose production the White House has now given the "green light," will merely complement the huge arsenal of toxic combat substances already in the possession of the United States. According to the press, more than 3 million units of chemical munitions containing a total of 150,000 metric tons of lethal toxins are currently stored at the Pentagon's dumps in the United States and NATO countries.

Washington's present decision is yet another indication that the United States does not intend to change its course of effectively blocking progress at the talks on banning chemical weapons being held within the framework of the Geneva disarmament conference.

"I believe that the administration's decision to go ahead with the production of binary munitions is a big mistake," James Bush, deputy director of the Washington Defense Information Center, said in an interview. "It can only be assessed as a bellicose, aggressive step fraught with the extreme danger of a chemical arms race."

'Especially Dangerous for Europe'

OW021143 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 31 Jul 86

[Viktor Konnov commentary; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The U.S. Administration has decided to begin manufacturing the most modern chemical weapons -- binary ammunition.

Here is our commentary:

[Konnov] Hello comrades. White House spokesman Speakes made this announcement. He also made it known that the Pentagon, together with the NATO High Command in Europe, were entrusted to work out the plans for the deployment, under appropriate conditions, of this ammunition in Western Europe. Let me first remind you what U.S. binary weapons represent. Unlike conventional chemical ammunition, binary ones are equipped with two or more chemical components that are stored in separate containers. During the flight of shells, bombs, and rockets towards their targets, an interaction of these components takes place creating, as the result of a chemical reaction, a highly toxic lethal substance, capable of striking down all living things. In concrete terms we are speaking about the production of the chemical bomb, the "big eye", which is a 155mm binary artillery shell. The Pentagon has already been assigned nearly \$160 million for its production, whereas for the creation of a full U.S. Army chemical arsenal, the colossal sum of \$10 billion will be expended.

The U.S. binary program is especially dangerous for Europe. Washington makes no secret that binary weapons are intended to be deployed in West European countries, primarily in the FRG, the UK, Italy, as well as Turkey. Here Washington's insidiousness becomes apparent once again. Hoping to draw a retaliatory strike away from its own territory, it is placing the territories and the populations of its allies under such a strike. The Soviet Union is resolutely condemning plans to produce and deploy binary weapons. It has done, and is doing, all that is possible to have chemical weapons of all varieties banned, as soon as possible, and to destroy all stockpiles.

The Soviet leadership has, on many occasions, said that a chemical free zone should be created in central Europe, and that the USSR would be prepared to guarantee and to respect the status of this zone. Such a guarantee would become effective if the United States, doing its part, acted likewise.

CSCE, Summit Accords 'Cast Aside'

PM041521 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 86 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov commentary: "Regardless"]

[Text] The U.S. President has sent a message to Congress, informing it that, in conjunction with the NATO Command in Europe, the administration has drawn up a plan to deploy American binary chemical weapons in Europe "in crisis situations." The job of pushing the large-scale program for the production of a new type of chemical weapons through Congress and the NATO organs has thereby been completed.

The provocative nature of the White House statement is quite obvious: It was made precisely at the time when supporters of peace and international cooperation are making the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. As is well-known, in that document the conference participants declared "the interest of all in efforts aimed at reducing military confrontation and promoting disarmament..."

Not only the Helsinki ideas have been cast aside. The corresponding Soviet-American Geneva accords are also being disregarded. The will of the European people, protesting against being turned into nuclear and chemical hostages of the Pentagon, is being ignored. The objections raised by the governments of a number of NATO countries opposed to Washington's dangerous plans are not being taken into consideration. By means of various maneuvers, ways have been found even of circumventing the stand taken by the U.S. Congress, which made beginning the production of binary munitions conditional on the West Europeans' consenting to accept them on their territory "in crisis situations."

The unceremonious treatment Washington administrators apply to their NATO allies is demonstrated, for example, by a statement from U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle who, speaking about chemical weapons, said in plain terms: "The weapons under discussion are American weapons. Whether they are created or not is up to us, and not the parliaments of other countries to decide."

And so, the Pentagon has already deployed its Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries; it has started secretly deploying in some NATO countries nuclear projectiles that can be made into neutron munition.

Now it has openly announced that the production of binary weapons is soon to begin in the United States. This will start a new round in the chemical arms race.

In an attempt to calm alarmed public opinion, the apologists of "silent death" apparently innocently assure us that the matter will be restricted to the mere stockpiling of new chemical munitions in the United States -- so they say. But everyone knows that the Pentagon plans to use these weapons where they can yield the greatest possible "effect," that is, in densely populated Western Europe. It is also obvious to everyone that there is only one step from beginning the production of binary weapons to deploying these weapons on the territory of West European states belonging to NATO. And with regard to the infamous "crisis situations" in which the new generation of chemical weapons will be deployed, everyone is well aware of the wealth of experience that the Pentagon "top brass" has in creating such situations....

Washington has taken a new and dangerous step that once again attests to the U.S. intention to carry on regardless in the arms race and in the building up of its arsenals of mass destruction means under cover of its hypocritical statements about its "desire for peace."



## Foreign Ministry Briefing

LD041423 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1313 GMT 4 Aug 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Aug (TASS) -- The Soviet Union has frequently drawn attention to the dangerous consequences both for Europe and for the entire world concerning the implementation of the U.S. plans to create binary weapons, stated Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at a briefing held today for Soviet and foreign journalists.

In essence, the U.S. decision to produce binary weapons programs the chemical arms race for the future, he noted. Such a decision contradicts the goal of everyone of eliminating chemical weapons, and runs counter to the accords reached at the Geneva summit on ending the arms race on earth, stressed the spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Implementation of the U.S. decision will also inflict serious damage on the talks regarding agreement on a convention to ban chemical weapons that are being held at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. The Soviet Union recently put forward new constructive proposals at this conference.

The Soviet Union is striving to ban chemical weapons with sufficient proper monitoring [pr dostatochnom dolzhnom kontrole] stressed G. Gerasimov. In addition, the Soviet proposals take into account the stances of many states, including the stance of the United States.

The spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs pointed out that the Soviet Union is in favor of the most effective and stringent monitoring of a chemical weapons ban, of eliminating chemical-weapon stocks, and the capacity for their production. Evidence of this, noted G. Gerasimov, is seen in the progress already achieved at the talks on all aspects of monitoring compliance with a future convention. The Soviet Union agrees to the holding of on-site inspection upon request, on its territory, if any state believes that a violation of the convention is taking place on the Soviet Union's part.

## Talks in CD Recalled

LD031959 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Aug 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] In word, U.S. officials are in favor of many things. They are even in favor of a ban on nuclear tests, true as a distant aim. But they are continuing tests for now. [passage omitted]

And again in word, U.S. officials are in favor of a ban on chemical weapons sometime in the cloudless future. But, for now, the President has notified Congress that he has fulfilled its conditions and is producing binary chemical weapons. The conditions were that the Europeans would be persuaded to accept this U.S. present, for chemical weapons are just about useless on U.S. territory.

A plan of measures for the siting of binary weapons in Western Europe in the event of extraordinary circumstances has been drawn up not with the allies but with the NATO command. However, West European countries are coming out in favor of banning and scrapping chemical weapons.

Talks are being conducted on this matter at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Our country has put forward specific proposals. Against this background those in Washington are lavishing praise on the nerve paralyzing innovations. These are not the out of date ovs [Russian abbreviation for toxic agents] toxic agents, when the victims would spit out their lungs in bits and pieces over the years. These are the latest achievements of military and chemical thought that strike on the spot, and although there are additional troubles for the burial detachments, the medical staff is relieved of their cares to make up for it.

As the President put it, binary weapons are weapons capable of maintaining life -- a bold epithet.

#### DPRK Paper Cited

PM061308 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Aug 86 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "To Repulse the Intrigues"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 4 Aug -- The plans by U.S. ruling circles to speed up the production of binary chemical weapons testify to the aggressive nature of U.S. imperialism. For the sake of its predatory interests it is likely to embark on any adventure, the newspaper MINJU CHOSON emphasizes.

By building up preparations for chemical warfare, Washington is acting in breach of existing agreements and disregarding the demands by the progressive international public which advocates that a reliable barrier be placed the path of producing yet another barbaric variety of mass destruction weapons, the newspaper notes. People across the ocean are looking lustfully at Europe where, in the opinion of Pentagon strategists, the use of binary weapons could be particularly effective.

Increasingly active attempts are being made by the United States to involve South Korea in the implementation of its aggressive schemes. More than 10 plants engaged in the production of toxic gases have been built there, and there are regular militarist games during which operations using chemical weapons are rehearsed.

As a result of Washington's intrigues, the danger of a new war starting in the Korean peninsula is growing considerably.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1505

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

REPORT ON FRG'S GENSCHER SOVIET PRESS AGENCY INTERVIEW

LD281534 Hamburg DPA in German 1225 GMT 28 Jul 86

[Text] Bonn, 28 Jul (DPA) — In an interview with the Soviet *Novosti* press agency published by the Foreign Ministry on Monday, Hans-Dietrich Genscher said that a worldwide chemical weapons ban seems achievable "in the foreseeable future, in any case before 1 December 1987." It is a matter of quickly working toward results on the basis of the proposals on the table in all negotiating forums.

From the American-Soviet negotiations in Geneva, Bonn expects specific steps toward the negotiating aims agreed on 8 January 1985 and stressed at the Geneva summit in order to prevent an arms race in space and end it on earth. The Federal Government shows special interest in an agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons.

/8309

CSO: 5200/2735

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

UK TRIES TO BREAK IMPASSE IN CHEMICAL WEAPONS TALKS

Geneva Proposal

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 16 Jul 86 p 6

[Article by David Adamson]

[Text]

BRITAIN TRIED to break down the biggest remaining obstacle to an agreement banning chemical weapons yesterday with a new proposal on the right to inspect suspect facilities at short notice. Mr Tim Renton, Foreign Office Minister, told the Disarmament Conference in Geneva that the proposals were a "serious attempt to establish a basis for acceptable compromise."

The right to "challenge inspection" has been hotly argued between the American and Russian delegations since the Americans put forward their draft treaty more than two years ago.

The Americans want the right to inspect any establishment at 24 hours notice. Russia wants more time, and the right to refuse inspection on grounds of national security. They fear that the United States would use a right of challenge to look at any suspect military establishment.

The British, who are in the chair this year in the conference's chemical weapons committee, decided some time ago that the "challenge" clause in the American draft was impossible to negotiate.

The new proposal gives a challenged state 10 days in which to satisfy the challenger that it is not in breach of the agreement. It accepts that in "some very exceptional circum-

stances" a state would have a limited right to refuse a demand for direct inspection of a site by the technical secretariat set up under the agreement.

In these exceptional circumstances a state would have to propose alternative measures to provide sufficient information to resolve the problem. The nature of the "alternative measures" is not spelled out.

The British Government would draw "rather sombre conclusions" about the future of the negotiations and the commitment of some countries to their success if the proposal was not given "genuine and serious" consideration, he said.

He noted that there were now 20 nations which either possessed chemical weapons or were thinking of acquiring them. As many as 10,000 people are believed to have been casualties of chemical weapons in the Gulf War.

Shevardnadze Reaction

Edinburgh THE SCOTSMAN in English 15 Jul 86 pp 1, 2

[Article by John Lichfield]

[Excerpts]

A Government initiative to clear the final obstacles to a worldwide ban on chemical weapons got a positive first reaction from the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr Eduard Shevardnadze, at the start of two days of talks in Britain yesterday.

Mr Shevardnadze later formally defrosted British-Soviet relations — which have been chilled since last autumn's reciprocal expulsions of alleged spies, by inviting Mrs Thatcher and Sir Geoffrey Howe to make separate visits to Moscow.

The Prime Minister discussed nuclear disarmament and the prospects for a second Superpower summit this winter in an extended two-hour conversation with Mr Shevardnadze in Downing Street yesterday afternoon. Both subjects will be covered in more detail when Mr Shevardnadze meets the Foreign Secretary again this morning.

The first, three-hour meeting of the two Foreign Ministers yesterday at Chevening, Kent, Sir Geoffrey's official country residence, was dominated by the 40-nation chemical weapons abolition talks in Geneva. The Government, which is chairing the talks until they adjourn next month, gave Mr Shevardnadze a preview of the compromise proposals it intends to table formally in Geneva today.

The proposals are intended to bridge the gulf between

Soviet and US negotiating positions on arrangements for ensuring obedience to a chemical weapons ban. After unexpected progress in recent months, verification is now regarded as the major remaining obstacle to agreement on a worldwide moratorium on the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons after 25 years of talks.

Moscow has rejected Washington's demand that any country should have the right to accuse another of a breach and make an on-site inspection within 48 hours. The Government's proposals suggest that a challenge should be followed by an inspection within ten days.

But, in a concession to Soviet obsession with secrecy, the British proposals would allow the challenged state to offer other means of convincing its accuser that it had not breached the chemical arms ban.

Senior Government officials said later that Mr Shevardnadze had expressed interest and seemed attracted to the British compromise. They said the proposals had been discussed with Washington and other allies in advance. But they conceded that they would have to be negotiated with the United States as well as the Soviet Union.

If all went well, the officials said they believed a comprehensive ban on chemical armaments could be negotiated in fine detail within 12 months.

/9317  
CSO: 5240/075

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MATERIALS TO MAKE MUSTARD GAS EASILY AVAILABLE IN NETHERLANDS

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 9 Jul 86 pp 1,2

[Report by Frans van Klaveren: "Oh, and Also 25 Kilos of Mustard Gas"--"Dutch Control of Raw Materials for Poison Gas is Inadequate."]

[Text] Amsterdam, 9 Jul--The deathly mustard gas, used as a chemical weapon in the war between Iran and Iraq, can be ordered directly within the BENELUX. Moreover, it is no trouble at all to obtain the chemical raw materials for the very simple manufacture of mustard gas, since not all the constituents appear on the black list drawn up by the government.

Discovery

This discovery was made by a group of chemistry students at the University of Amsterdam when, in the framework of a study assignment, they made an investigation into the availability of, amongst other things, mustard gas. Meanwhile the five students and their project leader bundled their experiences into a report.

"The raw materials for both variants of mustard gas are all for sale and can be freely imported and exported. Customs don't exercise any control over them," according to the findings of the chemistry students. "The most dangerous chemicals are currently traded in the Netherlands without any control. Thus any terrorist group has the means of making chemical weapons.

Mustard gases are among the blister-causing gases. These gases irritate the skin and eyes (absorption via the head and lungs) and when they penetrate into the blood circulation they are deadly.

Wipe Out

One of the students phoned Jansen Chemistry, a big company in Belgium which supplies chemicals, and ordered 22.5 kilograms of raw material of one kind (appearing on the black list) and 60 kg of another kind. "The materials, according to the investigators, would be delivered free of charges. All you had to do was pay the value-added tax. "For the sum of 500 guilders," say the students, "we were in principle able to wipe out 1.1 million people, assuming that 12 mg per person is deadly in 50 percent of the cases."

It also didn't seem to present any problem at Jansen Chemistry if an order were made for the pre-prepared nitrogen mustard gas which was in the factory catalogue.

"They only had 35 grams on hand. They were very willing to produce 25 kilograms for us on order. A price could not be quoted at that moment, but we could be assured of a hefty discount on the catalogue price if we ordered such a large amount. Here too, we explicitly asked whether there were conditions of delivery. There were none."

#### Talk Further

A female investigator telephoned a chemical firm in Arnhem. The intention was to gather information (costs, delivery date, terms of delivery, etc.) on the supply of 400 kilograms of material X and 110 kilograms of material Y (raw materials for sulphur mustard gas). These materials would have to be exported to Greece by the company and were destined for the local plastic industry there. The only reaction from the side of the factory was: "If you order 400 tons of material X, we'll talk further."

After these findings, the students didn't find it necessary to approach other chemical companies. They were able to make poison gas in abundance.

In 1984 the Netherlands announced it wanted to start as rapidly as possible to control the export of raw materials for the manufacture of chemical weapons. "The Netherlands went further than other countries," according to the investigators of the University of Amsterdam. In granting permits, one would take into account the destination, the size of the shipment and the final use intended for the materials. In 1986 the Netherlands had prepared a list--the investigators themselves call it a little list--of materials for which an export permit had to be applied for. "It is difficult to ascertain, however, whether 4 tons of material Z (basic material of nitrogen mustard gas), for example, will indeed be used in Italy for the plastic industry and won't be transported further to Iraq where one can very simply produce sulphur mustard gas from it. A big gap in our system, namely, is the cooperation between the European countries. Italy hardly has any export regulations for chemicals. The only control we further have in the Netherlands is with the customs. But customs officials are not able to recognize the materials that are on the list because they are not chemists. Except for a few random tests, there is hardly any control at all at the borders."

"In the Netherlands anyone is free to buy what he wishes," according to the investigators. "In a manner of speaking, you can start producing mustard gas in your backyard, leaving aside whether you would survive that."

#### Five Categories

Chemical weapons can be roughly divided into five categories: 1) vomit- and tear gases (only deadly in high concentrations); 2) asphyxiant gases (for example chlorine and phosgene gas), used in World War I but strategically of less interest because of their difficult dispersion; 3) blister-causing gases (for example mustard gas); 4) blood gases (for example Prussic acid and

chlorine cyanide), also used in World War I and likewise out of tactical considerations not of interest due to its dependence on meteorological conditions; 5) nerve gases (for example tabun and sarin), by far the most dangerous but the most difficult to manufacture. Nerve gases are deadly in 50 percent of the cases at between 0.3 and 0.8 mg. Mustard gases--deadly in 50 percent of the cases at 12 mg--are in the next to most dangerous category. Chemical weapons are called "the weapon of the poor." They cause little damage to factories and buildings, which is also considered an advantage of neutron bombs, the investigators proffer. "In conclusion, chemical weapons have a strong psychological influence. They function as an invisible and noiseless threat and therefore are appropriate for surprise attacks and acts of sabotage."

According to the Amsterdam students, who say they were shocked by the outcome of their investigation, the control on raw materials for nerve gases is stricter. "Those materials appear on the list of the export decree on strategic weapons and potentially require application for an export permit. But even then the materials can often be exported as insecticides. The reason for the carelessness with respect to mustard gases is completely unclear and very illogical: the nerve gases are much more difficult to manufacture and therefore are not appropriate for countries with limited industrial and intellectual capacities--Iraq, for example. For mustard gas, however, one can find in any university library a very simple synthesis process which can also be carried out easily with limited industrial possibilities. Mustard gas is the least expensive manner to wage war. If you want to wage a poison gas war on a limited scale, the Jansen Chemistry company in Belgium, for example, can give you a good start."

#### More Control

At the end of the report the students urge the Dutch Government to expand the current list of raw materials and carry out stricter controls. According to the students, the government should also act as an intermediary between the company and the buyer, which is only possible with large orders. "The government ought to set a limit for that," according to the investigators.

A spokesman of the department of Economic Affairs is willing to admit that the system of permits applied to the export of materials is not 100 percent foolproof, but that it is the "most attainable" under current relations, assuming that other countries stick to international agreements on this point.

8700

CSO: 5200/2721



EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: W. EUROPEAN LACK OF RESPONSE TO PACT PROPOSALS HIT

'Asymmetry' Claim Rebutted

PM310934 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jul 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Vasin article: "Hiding Behind a Fig Leaf: How the West Regards the Warsaw Pact Countries' Peace Initiatives"]

[Text] The large-scale, new initiative put forward at the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest offers real opportunities for a phased and verifiable reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. Its implementation would be an important step toward averting the threat of war and would make it possible to reduce all components of both alliances' ground forces and tactical strike air forces in Europe by approximately 25 percent by the early nineties. Such a reduction would amount to more than 500,000 men from each side. The groups of armed forces opposing each other on the European Continent would thus be reduced by more than 1 million men.

The socialist countries' proposal to reduce the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe is so significant that the West has not been able to dismiss it. In a number of NATO capitals officials have stated that the new proposal of the USSR and its allies has been received with "great interest" and is being "studied" attentively. For example, Willi Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, has made a statement on the need for serious talks on this issue. He has urged the West to put forward constructive counterproposals and help improve the atmosphere in relations with the East European countries. (F. Svalen), chairman of the Christian People's Party, has also stressed that the initiative is creating a "big impression" and is distinguished by its "flexibility" and "readiness to consider the interests" of the West European states.

But by no means has everyone in the West assessed the socialist community countries' proposals realistically. While hiding behind bombastic statements about the desire to strengthen "stability and security" in Europe and the world and to establish a verifiable "all-embracing balance" of forces at lower levels, the U.S. Administration and the NATO leadership would like to act in completely the opposite direction -- that of the arms race and confrontation. In so doing, certain NATO circles are trying to play down or distort the Warsaw Pact countries' peace-loving initiative. For example, at a Christian Social Union congress held in Nuremburg, F.-J. Strauss and H. Kohl asserted that there was nothing new in the Warsaw Pact states' position.

The NATO "critics" are trying to hide their unseemly actions behind a fig leaf of imaginary objectivity. Once again a fuss is being made about a supposed "disbalance" or "asymmetry" in conventional arms between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, which would mean that an equal reduction of conventional armaments would not meet the principle of equal security and would lead to a reinforcement of Soviet superiority.

The attempts being made in the West to "prove" the Warsaw Pact's "overwhelming superiority" in conventional arms amounts, to put it mildly, to dishonest manipulation of the figures. NATO's representatives are deliberately distorting the picture of the correlation of forces between the sides: They do not take account of the mobilizational and manpower resources, reserve formations, and stocks of armaments and equipment on the NATO side; they omit from their calculations the French and Spanish Armed Forces, as well as the armed forces subordinated to national commands; and they exaggerate the figures for the Warsaw Pact armed forces and understate their own.

Objectively using the main indicators of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, you get the following picture. In numbers of armed forces the NATO bloc, including the forces of France and Spain, is not only inferior to the Warsaw Pact but even exceeds it somewhat.

This fact is acknowledged by London's Institute for Strategic Studies, an institute that enjoys prestige in the West. It is common knowledge that the North Atlantic alliance exceeds the Warsaw Pact in numbers of combat-ready divisions and antitank facilities and has approximate equality in artillery and armored equipment. NATO has a slight numerical superiority in fighter-bombers and ground attack planes but is inferior to the Warsaw Pact in air defense interceptor-fighters. Overall, then, in terms of conventional arms we have an approximate balance of forces.

In the search for arguments against conventional arms reductions, Western propaganda uses the far-fetched factor of "geostrategic asymmetry": It argues that the removal of troops beyond the Urals is not equivalent to their removal even to Britain, let alone across the ocean. They deliberately "overlook" the fact that the socialist countries' proposal talks not about the withdrawal of troops but about the disbandment of military divisions, units, and subunits together with their organic armaments and combat hardware. Their personnel are to be demobilized and the armaments subject to reduction are to be destroyed or stockpiled on national territory in accordance with prescribed procedures.

There are also in the West those military "specialists" who claim that the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is not defensive. And yet it was the USSR that assumed a commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons, imposed a moratorium on nuclear explosions, and took out of service the SS-20 missiles deployed in retaliation to the siting of ground-based U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Europe. The Soviet state and its allies are not striving for military superiority. They reaffirmed the proposal for the simultaneous disbandment of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and state that under no circumstances would they ever begin military operations against any other state -- either in Europe or any other part of the world -- so long as they are not the subject of aggression themselves. If the West believes this to be aggressiveness, one may be allowed to ask what then is to be considered love of peace?

The official reaction of those people to whom the Warsaw Pact states' new proposal were addressed cannot but cause concern. Although talking about the need to study them, the West is clearly in no hurry to do that. The "high-level operational group for conventional arms monitoring" set up at the NATO Council session in Halifax and tasked with studying the socialist countries' new proposal, plans to present its preliminary report in October and its final report not until December at the next North Atlantic bloc council session. Here you cannot help thinking of Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, who cynically "advised" America's allies to do their utmost to play down the significance of the USSR's proposals in the disarmament sphere and delay their discussion as much as possible until "the West exhausts its stock of new ideas."

### West European 'Alarm'

PM061051 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Aug 86 p 3

[Political observer Vladimir Katin "View of Events": "Dialogue in Favor of Peace"]

[Text] Delivering a vivid speech in Vladivostok recently, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out that he has recently had many meetings with leaders of European states and with various politicians of European countries. "Whether good or bad," he said, "the Helsinki process of dialogue, talks, and agreements is taking place in Europe. This imposes a certain stability and reduces the likelihood of armed conflicts."

Indeed, our continent has lived without wars for more than 40 years. However, tension is being fueled. For it is right here, in Europe, that the two mightiest military groups confront each other. Our country is concerned at this circumstance and actively seeks to defuse the situation. Thus, this summer, for example, has been full of major diplomatic events focused on one objective -- to secure lasting, mature detente. Above all, there have been the recent visits to the Soviet Union by Spanish Prime Minister F. Gonzalez, French President F. Mitterand, FRG Federal Vice Chancellor and Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher, and Turkish Government head T. Ozal, as well as talks in London by E.A. Shevardnadze, the leader of Soviet diplomacy. Thus, as we see, East-West contacts are multiplying and dialogue is becoming more active and substantial. What, nonetheless, is its chief aspect most characteristic of the present stage?

For all the multiplicity of problems and topics that the Soviet leaders have discussed recently with high-ranking guests in the Kremlin, I wish to single out one fundamental aspect of our country's modern policy -- the desire to prompt the West to realize the seriousness of the impending threat and to join in the process of saving mankind from nuclear destruction. Pardon me -- the reader will stop me -- but does any Western leader really call outright for war and campaign for an arms race? The paradox is that no one calls for this in words, but nor, alas, is anyone doing anything on a practical plane to change the international situation for the better.

We understand that France, Spain, the FRG, and other NATO countries are closely linked, albeit to different degrees, with the United States by their obligations as allies. All this is so. And yet the Soviet Union has no intention at all of causing them to quarrel with Washington or of converting anyone.

Let us take the bare facts, as it were, and look at just what the Soviet Union strives for and what it earnestly calls on others to do. In a short space of time our country has proposed ending nuclear tests; and it has adhered unilaterally for a whole year to its moratorium (the United States has conducted 15 explosions during this time); it has proposed the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, while preventing the militarization of space; it has proposed destroying Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe; abandoning chemical weapons; cutting armed forces by 1 million men and reducing the number of conventional arms in Europe; ensuring reliable verification [kontrol] at all stages of disarmament; creating an all-embracing system of international security; and reaching agreement on USSR and U.S. nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years.

Is all this of interest to West Europeans? Undoubtedly. They may have no sympathy for socialism or the Soviet system, but they must see that these proposals, if fulfilled, save the lives equally of Soviet, Portuguese, Dutch, and British people. [paragraph continues]

So why, then, do the governments of West European NATO countries not take the Soviet initiatives to eliminate medium-range nuclear missile weapons and to reduce conventional arms seriously? Why do they not let themselves be guided by the instinct for self-preservation and not by blind -- in this instance -- "Atlantic solidarity," and invite Washington to take a constructive attitude toward the Soviet initiatives and discuss them in a businesslike way? In making these proposals, the USSR hopes that people in the West will take an unbiased attitude toward our ideas, with a desire to see their positive substance.

In advancing our initiatives, we do not seek to drive wedges between the United States and its NATO allies. The Soviet Union proceeds from the political and military realities that exist on the continent. And these realities are as follows: Of 20 U.S. air bases abroad at which American aircraft with nuclear weapons are in a state of permanent combat readiness, 14 are located in Western Europe. It is also a reality of our age of the split atom that there are more than 150 nuclear reactors on the European Continent. In the event of even a conventional conflict a few artillery shells would suffice to plunge Europe and the whole world into the abyss of uncontrolled radioactive death... So, any armed conflict in Europe could detonate a world catastrophe.

"Europe must really once again become the chief character in its own history and be able to play to the full its role as a factor for equilibrium and stability in international relations." F. Mitterrand uttered those words in the Kremlin recently. We share that view. But the truth is that all fine words and good intentions are verified in practice and only in practice. In the complex European situation it is necessary to urgently proceed to action -- this is the command of the times.

The attention of FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher was drawn to this circumstance, in particular, during his 3-hour meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. We must not close our eyes to the fact that the FRG continues to play the role of the continental sword of the United States, which the latter can always draw from its scabbard, should it so wish. The FRG now has the world's largest concentration of American nuclear weapons in terms of the number of warheads per square kilometer of territory. The FRG foreign minister's attention was also drawn to this during the talks.

While taking note of the peace-loving statements by FRG representatives, M.S. Gorbachev pointed to an inconsistency in FRG policy. Statements in favor of FRG responsibility do not tie in with practical support for the U.S. Administration's bellicose course or with the country's involvement in the "star wars" program. This also applies to other West European countries that are being or have already been drawn into the American program. Yes, there are many influential people in the West who display enthusiastic optimism regarding military-space fantasies. Mankind is undoubtedly going to the stars through sacrifice and torment, but in this case the thorns of torment are such that they could completely drain it of blood and destroy it. Our logic is easy to understand: Replacing some arms with other, more refined arms is not progress but regression.

Everyone in Western Europe is now campaigning for a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Its fate depends on the American side, on its readiness to discuss not abstract subjects but the specific matters suggested by the Soviet leadership that are of practical significance for saving the planet from nuclear catastrophe. M.S. Gorbachev particularly dwelt on this question in his Vladivostok speech: "As regards a new Soviet-American summit meeting, I can repeat: We favor such a meeting. But we resolutely oppose interpreting the accord reached at the last meeting in Geneva as supposedly amounting to a promise to meet in the future. No, the main issue President Reagan and I agreed on then and signed was that we will strive to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations and to improve the international situation and will accelerate the course of the arms reduction talks. A new meeting must serve this."

The West European leaders' statements in favor of a Soviet-American summit meeting generally reflect their alarm over the fate of peace on the continent. But if this is so, it would be logical and natural to join in concrete work in this direction. Moscow has already made specific and clear proposals -- both in the sphere of eliminating nuclear arms and regarding reducing conventional arms. So it is now a question of political will, the shortage of which is very palpable in the West. In addition, it is high time to abandon the practice current in Western Europe of intimidating people with the "Soviet threat."

The most convincing evidence of the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions are its plans for creation aimed at revealing Soviet society's entire vast potential. At this very promising stage in its development the USSR intends to cooperate widely with all Western states. The material base of political dialogue and mutual interest and trust will thereby be strengthened, and the building of civilized relations of benefit to our entire European Continent and to the cause of peace throughout the world will proceed more successfully.

U.S. Pressure on Europe

PM050855 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Aug 86 Morning Edition pp 4, 5

[Editorial article: "Europe Must Set an Example; Warsaw Pact Member-Countries' Initiatives Open New Horizons"]

[Text] Almost 2 months have elapsed since the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest at which an extensive program for substantial reductions in armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals was put forward. It represents a substantial addition to the far-reaching proposals for the elimination of mass destruction weapons put forward by the Soviet Union on 15 January and takes account of considerations expressed in West European countries in respect of this kind of comprehensive approach to practical steps in the field of real disarmament.

In putting forward the new program, the Warsaw Pact member-states are not setting any preconditions for the beginning of a pointed discussion of their proposals. They have expressed their readiness to consider in a constructive spirit other proposals on this subject put forward by NATO member-states, neutral and nonaligned states, and other European states.

Even the zealous advocates of the arms race in the NATO camp can hardly feel entirely comfortable sitting atop mountains of stockpiled lethal means. In terms of the concentration of these means per square kilometer, Europe, and particularly central Europe, has not match on our planet, and its saturation with explosive materials is increasing.

There are people who, by claiming that even in these conditions the continent has been able to avoid bloody conflicts, try to make out that there may be no need for concern at the further escalation of the arms race. Not one session of leading NATO organs passed without exhortations for an even more feverish buildup of this arms race.

Washington in particular is interested in this, demanding from its allies -- the governments of West European countries -- that they steadily increase their spending on conventional arms. Overt and behind-the-scenes conflicts on this subject between West European countries on one side and the United States on the other are continuing. The U.S. allies long ago reached a critical level of military appropriations in respect of their economies and finances. [paragraph continues]

However, they lack the political determination to reject the myth of the "Soviet threat" foisted on them by the Pentagon. This myth represents the main propaganda lever in the hands of the U.S. military when applying pressure in order to force the issue of militarization.

Even before, the falseness of these claims was quite obvious. But now that the socialist countries of the Warsaw Pact have put forward their new proposals, clear prospects have emerged for accords that could enable Europe to breathe much more freely having cast off the burden of dangerous and ruinous arms programs.

We are prepared, without hesitation, to eliminate the "surplus" in weapons of which we have more in order to secure corresponding Western reductions in weapons of which the West has more.

In other words, it has been proposed to seek a balance at considerably lower levels.

This task, as the Soviet side has pointed out, is a realistic one that brooks no delay. We have a right to expect a positive and concrete response from the West since what the Warsaw Pact states have put forward are practical, specific proposals.

As an initial step a one-shot, mutual reduction by 100,000-150,000 men each in the numerical strength of the rival military and political alliances' forces within the next 1-2 years is envisaged. Within the framework of this measure the reduction of tactical strike aircraft would be of great importance. Immediately after this has been achieved, further substantial reductions could follow so that, by the early nineties, both alliances' ground forces and tactical strike aviation in Europe could be reduced by approximately one-fourth compared with the present level. The process of armed forces and arms reductions could be taken even further.

It is proposed to elaborate and implement additional measures capable of building up the confidence of Warsaw Pact and NATO countries, and of all European states, that surprise offensive operations will not be launched against them.

Steps to ensure effective and reliable verification [kontrol] of the implementation of armed forces and arms reductions are envisaged. To this end it is proposed to utilize both national technical means and international procedures including on-site inspections.

With the utmost responsibility the Warsaw Pact member-states have declared that they would never, under any circumstances, initiate military actions against any state either in Europe or in any other part of the world provided that they themselves are not the target of aggression.

Proposals have been put forward which in their spirit testify to the goodwill of the socialist states that have advanced them, in their content are specific and precise, and in their significance are absolutely essential if true security is to triumph on our continent.

The translation of these proposals into reality would mean the saving of vast material means that are currently being spent for military purposes even though they are urgently needed for civilian, peaceful purposes.

How were these proposals received in Western countries' government circles? There is no shortage of declarative statements by Western countries' officials about their allegiance to the idea of conventional arms reductions. The proposals made in Budapest are welcomed in general terms. [paragraph continues]

To oppose them openly would be impossible, even for the known opponents of such steps, because of political considerations.

At the latest NATO Council session in Halifax (Canada) it was decided to set up a special group to "study" the problem of conventional arms. That is where the Warsaw Pact member-states' proposals were sent.

Is this perhaps a tactical move designed to henceforth keep the socialist countries' new proposals from public view, a clearly ill-intentioned move? And how much time do they need in Western capitals to "study" these proposals?



Many questions of this kind arise. However, essentially, no intelligible answer on this account has so far been received from NATO countries' government circles. Meanwhile time does not stand still, nor are broad circles of the public prepared to condone such "spinning out" of a question that demands a clear answer rather than evasion of the issue.

It is absurd and criminal in the face of the nuclear threat to act according to the defunct scheme based on the premise that what is good for the socialist countries must be rejected by capitalist governments.

True, M.S. Gorbachev declared in Vladivostok, disarmament is advantageous for us, but it is just as advantageous for all people whose governments spend billions on the arms race. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary pointed out that our foreign policy initiatives stem from a profound concern for mankind's destiny.

The complex, contradictory dialectic of the present world situation is particularly visible in Europe. On one hand, as a result of persistent efforts and a great deal of work, it has been possible to agree to a historical code of rules, norms, and principles enshrined in the Final Act of the all-European Conference. The "spirit of Helsinki" has weathered the first trials and continues to serve stability and peace in Europe.

On the other hand, it is the presence on a colossal scale of mass destruction weapons on European soil, and also of more and more sophisticated and destructive conventional weapons, which moreover are largely controlled by the United States rather than the European governments, that creates not a remote, not a potential, but a direct threat to Europe and consequently the whole world.

It is enough to recall the raid on Libya in April by U.S. F-111 fighters based in Britain. This is not an isolated incident. The Pentagon makes no secret of the fact that U.S. bases in Western Europe are a bridgehead for actions against states in other parts of the world that Washington finds "unacceptable." For Europe this is fraught with countless pernicious consequences.

In their attempts to belittle the significance of the Warsaw Pact states' peace initiatives, describing them as "propaganda," the militarist circles are behaving as if the inflated military budgets for finance the arms race were "untouchable," whereas the rights and material well-being of the broad masses of the working people were fair game.

Europe set the rest of the world an example of a responsible approach to its destiny in adopting the CSCE Final Act in Helsinki. Now it is necessary to go further, to move on to steps of real disarmament on the European Continent. That will be an even more inspiring example to the entire world.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1507



## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### SOVIET ENVOYS VIEW CSCE, CDE, VIENNA FOLLOW-UP

#### Silin, Grinevskiy Comment

LD311709 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 31 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A press conference in Moscow today for Soviet and foreign journalists was devoted to the 11th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Comrade Silin, the deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, said in his speech:

[Begin Silin recording] The 11th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki has come around. For us this document has never lost, and is not losing, its immense significance, and it is not becoming tarnished in the eyes of the Soviet public nor in the eyes of the peace-loving public of Europe, nor of the whole world as time goes on. Now too, when a very complex situation has developed in the world and in Europe, this document is the beacon that enables the peace-loving and realistic forces of Europe and the whole world, adhering to the provisions of the Final Act, to move towards the normalization of international relations in Europe and worldwide, to move towards a new detente, a detente which will have a firmer foundation than that which we had in the 1970s, but backed up by those positive gains of the last decade which were reflected in the Final Act of Helsinki. [end recording]

[Announcer] The leader of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe Comrade Grinevskiy stressed the importance of the conference as an integral part of the European process:

[Begin Grinevskiy recording] What needs to be done to ensure success in Stockholm? as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary has said, it is time for all participants in the conference to display responsibility and flexibility; only serious, reciprocal concessions on the basis of equality, he said, can produce a positive effect. We hope the proposals we put forward on 18 July at the end of this session will give the conference dynamism, so it might complete its work successfully. We evaluate highly efforts by the neutral, nonaligned countries for progress at the conference, but for there to be stable progress reciprocal movements are needed in the West's positions too. So we welcome the mutual understanding achieved at the conference, that the time before the start of the final session be used to hold unofficial meetings and consultations to accelerate the elaboration of accords on the remaining unresolved issues. [end recording]

[Announcer] Participants in the press conference answered many questions from journalists. A more detailed account of the press conference is published in the press. [Video opens with long shot of five men on platform; close shots of the speakers show these to be from left to right: V.M. Tatarnikov, Ye. K. Silin, Yu. A. Gremitikh, O. A. Grinevskiy and one other unidentified person.]

#### More From Grinevskiy

LD311947 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 31 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS -- "The Soviet Union has been and is attaching much importance to the Stockholm forum as part of the CSCE process. It is precisely along these lines that a turn can be achieved both in European and international affairs", stated Oleg Grinevskiy, the leader of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm Conference on Security and Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

He spoke today at a press conference which was held at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs and which dealt with the eleventh anniversary of the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki.

"Success in Stockholm will be a step towards the success of the follow-up meeting in Vienna this year and an earnest of a good start for the second stage of the Stockholm Conference", he emphasized.

"The conference has gradually begun to make headway. The general atmosphere has appreciably changed for the better, and prospects for ending it with tangible results have opened up", Oleg Grinevskiy said.

Among positive results, he mentioned, first of all, the solution to the problem of notifications about air exercises, the question which had for long blocked headway at the conference. This arrangement now covers practically 90 percent of the entire air force activity in Europe.

Oleg Grinevskiy emphasized that respect for human rights was a substantial factor of peace. He said the Soviet Union came out in favour of an "effective and adequate verification" of the arrangement for confidence-building measures.

The leader of the Soviet delegation highly appreciated the efforts which have been or are being made by neutral and non-aligned countries for achieving progress at the conference, and emphasized that reciprocal moves on the part of the West, too, were essential for a steady headway.

### Tatarnikov on Confidence-Building

LD311955 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 31 Jul 86

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS -- The Helsinki Final Act has helped to achieve certain progress in the confidence-building effort, Major-General Viktor Tatarnikov, a spokesman for the General Staff of the Soviet armed forces, has pointed out.

He spoke today at a press conference at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Centre devoted to the 11th anniversary of the Helsinki accords.

"At present, we invite observers to military exercises, which enables the European nations to see for themselves that this military activity is not of a threatening character," General Tatarnikov said.

"The region to which the confidence-building measures apply is currently being expanded. Previously, it comprised Europe and the 250-kilometre zone east of our border, while now the zone has been expanded up to the Urals."

"Further confidence-building measures are being considered at the Stockholm Conference. It has been suggested, in particular, that notification should apply not only to the exercises of land troops, as now, but also to the exercises of amphibious forces and air-borne troops, and that information should be provided about air force exercises conducted at the end of ground troops exercises," Tatarnikov said.

The general emphasised that new parameters for notification were being worked out to lower its threshold.

"Earlier on, the notification parameter started at the threshold of 25,000. At present, a lower threshold is being discussed. We are prepared to discuss even lower thresholds than those currently under consideration at Stockholm."

### Moscow Press Conference

PM011316 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Aug 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "To Develop the Helsinki Accords. Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] The problem of strengthening peace in Europe remains one of the most important and most acute international-political problems facing mankind. This was emphasized in Moscow on 31 July, at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists devoted to the 11th anniversary of the signing of the CSCE Final Act.

Europe is the center of confrontation between the two military-political alliances, a location where an enormous mass of modern weapons is concentrated, Ye. K. Silin, deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, noted in his statement. This situation remains a most serious source of the arms race and military danger. And yet Europe has accumulated valuable experience in the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, both members of military alliances and neutrals.

Europe has a large enough economic and political potential to be able to speak up more confidently for itself and to pursue progress at talks that are being held.

The Soviet public places great hopes on the forthcoming Vienna meeting of states participating in the all-European process. [paragraph continues]

The Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation, in particular, has decided to establish, in addition to already existing commissions, a commission for humanitarian questions which will tackle the problems of cooperation in this sphere at public organization level.

There is much evidence to indicate that Europeans are tired of confrontation and tension. Broad circles of the European public do not want Europe to be perceived as a "theater of military operations." Our continent is called upon to set an example of constructive coexistence between different states aware of their interdependence, building relations based on trust.

In Soviet people's view, the main avenue leading to such a state of affairs lies through Europe's liberation from the explosive burden of nuclear, chemical, conventional, and other types of weapons. At the same time, Europe and the Europeans must show concern for the continuation of the unique phenomenon of the all-European process based on the Helsinki Final Act.

People in the USSR would like to see this process advance in all directions -- political, economic, humanitarian, and cultural.

Ambassador O.A. Grinevskiy, leader of the Soviet delegation at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measure and Disarmament in Europe as part of the all-European process.

Just over a month ago, he said, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined at one of its sessions the state of affairs at the Stockholm conference. The Soviet delegation was given instructions to actively pursue the fruitful completion of this important international forum on the basis of reciprocity.

It must be said frankly that the past month was not easy for the conference. It was a time of acute political struggle to begin resolving the unsolved problems. Gradually, the conference began to advance. There was a noticeable change for the better in the general atmosphere, and prospects emerged for its conclusion with weighty results.

Primarily, the ambassador went on, there was success in solving the problem of notification of air force maneuvers, in untying this tight knot which blocked progress at the conference for a long time. A significant common basis is also beginning to emerge regarding the question of ground forces maneuvers. Agreement was reached in the last few days that notification should cover ground forces maneuvers conducted jointly with air force and naval components and amphibious and airborne troops. Agreement on the parameters of such notification remains to be reached.

Considerable work has also been done on rendering the principle of nonuse of force more specific and more effective.

Some people say that a human rights provision must absolutely be a component of any accord. What does the question actually concern? For us it poses no problem at all. We are prepared to enshrine the provision that respect for human rights is a substantial factor for peace. This stems from the socialist countries' principled approach toward human rights as one of the components of an all-embracing system of international security.

Of course, quite a few complex problems still have to be solved to ensure the successful completion of the conference. One of them concerns the notification of troop movements into Europe from other regions and continents.

The solution of the problem of limiting the scale of military maneuvers remains as topical as ever. Finally, the problem of verification [proverka]. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries want to be firmly convinced that any agreements they conclude will be rigorously observed by everyone. This is why we advocate that accords on confidence-building measures be backed by effective and adequate verification [adekvatnaya proverka].

We welcome the mutual understanding reached at the conference that the period preceding the start of the concluding session should be used for unofficial meetings and consultations with a view to speeding up the elaboration of accords on the remaining unsolved questions.

Success in Stockholm is a step toward success at this fall's all-European meeting in Vienna and a guarantee of a good start at the second stage of the Stockholm conference which could fruitfully tackle disarmament questions.

Major General V.M. Tatarnikov, representative of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and Professor B.S. Krylov, representative of the All-union Scientific Research Institute of Soviet Legislation, took part in the press conference.

Answers were given to journalists' questions.

/9604

CSO: 5200/1507

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### SOVIET REPORT ON CSCE ANNIVERSARY HELSINKI SYMPOSIUM

Moscow RABOCHIY KLASS I SOVREMENNYI MIR in Russian No 6, Nov-Dec 86 pp 159-163

[Article by Igor Vladimirovich Kazey under the rubric "Communications": "A Useful Dialogue of Social Forces"]

[Excerpts] This article is the last work by learned secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences International Workers Movement Institute and candidate of historical sciences Igor Vladimirovich Kazey, who died tragically on 6 October 1985.

How does the public of Europe and North America evaluate the condition and prospects of the all-European process 10 years after Helsinki? The international symposium dedicated to the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe held in Helsinki to a significant degree made it possible to assess this. The following topic was discussed there: "The All-European Process: Trends and Prospects." The Finnish Committee for European Security and Cooperation (STETE) acted as the organizer of the symposium which ended on 1 September 1985. Many public figures and representatives of various political parties, trade unions, and mass movements, and scientists from different countries of Western Europe, the United States, and the socialist states participated in its meetings held in Finland's parliament building. Represented at the meeting in Helsinki, for example, were figures of the social democratic parties and workers occupational organizations from Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the FRG, and Belgium, Catholics and communists, and a number of experts on problems of European security and cooperation.

The symposium's work attracted a great deal of attention from Finland's mass media: the content of the main reports and speeches and the course of debate at its meetings were widely covered for a number of days by various organs of the press and in radio and television broadcasts. A press conference was organized; representatives of social, scientific, and trade union organizations of a number of countries took part in it.

Opening the symposium, STETE president P. Tyuyelyayarvi appealed to its participants "not only to evaluate the problems of the past but to a greater degree outline our goals for the future by asking where we go from here."

P. Vyayuryunen, the minister of foreign affairs, welcomed the participants in the symposium on behalf of the government of Finland. He noted that for his country the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe "was and remains a unique forum facilitating the development of the policy of neutrality. The peaceful solution of European problems and closer contacts and cooperation among peoples and states, regardless of their political, economic, and social systems, conforms to Finland's national interests." In the opinion of the country's official representative -- the host of the all-European conference, an open and honest dialogue should serve the development of the Helsinki process as well as the success of the conference of the countries participating in the conference in Vienna.

Representatives of the U.S. and USSR communities gave reports at the first plenary meeting: Ambassador G. Leonard (from the leadership of the Washington "Committee for National Security") and USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences IMRD [International Workers Movement Institute] T.T. Timofeyev (member of the Buro of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation).

The exchange of opinions which took place touched upon many aspects of the all-European process: political, military, economic, cultural, and scientific. The ideas expressed by the representatives of the USSR and the other socialist states a month earlier at the meeting of ministers of foreign affairs from 33 states of Europe, the United States, and Canada received a significant response at the symposium. Despite the difference in approaches, the delegates of the meeting firmly favored the continued process of detente and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The new Soviet peace initiatives, including the announcement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev on the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions until 1 January 1986 and his interview with the American magazine TIME, were praised at the forum of social forces in Helsinki. The position of the Soviet leadership was justifiably regarded as an expression of good will by the USSR and of its desire to persistently try to achieve real progress on the way to reducing nuclear armaments and consolidating peace and international security.

The speeches of many participants stressed the historic link between the two anniversary dates which were celebrated this year: the 40th anniversary of the Victory over Hitler's fascism and Japanese militarism and the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the All-European conference. The origins of the Helsinki process date back to the results of World War II. The Final Act of Helsinki fixed the political realities which took shape in the world after the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition. This document reflects the expectations and hopes of the peoples of Europe for a peaceful future, a stable mechanism of political relations, and mutually advantageous cooperation. It is precisely because of this, as the Swedish representative and prominent figure in the social democratic movement B. Carlsson noted, that



"the all-European conference on security and cooperation is the main event in Europe's postwar history."

The adherence of two different socioeconomic systems to the policies of detente and coexistence has a stronger impact in Europe. There can be no other links between them but peaceful cooperation in the nuclear age. Recognition of this fact is the basis of the Helsinki Accords. The need for this cooperation in various spheres has become even more urgent in the mid-1980's, participants in the symposium emphasized. This is the result of those processes which received development in the last decade. The refinement and accumulation of new and more destructive types of weapons which outstrips and complicates the political process of negotiations on arms limitation continues at an accelerated rate. The internationalization of economic, political, social, and cultural life is increasing and interrelationship and interdependence among peoples is intensifying. The pace of the scientific-technical revolution has accelerated and at the same time the scope of its socioeconomic and political consequences has increased. The problem of protecting the environment has become more crucial for the states of Europe. These types of pressing universal all-European problems, in the words of B. Carlsson, can only be solved through the joint efforts of the countries of Eastern and Western Europe.

The participants in the symposium not only devoted main attention to evaluating the present situation in Europe but also to the prospects for its development. They stated that by the early 1980's progress in the detente process had slowed down. The military-political situation in Europe became seriously complicated after the United States began to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles on the territories of a number of NATO states in late 1983. The steps taken by the United States to militarize space are leading the arms race to a qualitatively new stage and have posed a threat to the negotiations going on in Geneva to limit nuclear and space weapons. There has been no progress in negotiations to reduce armed forces and arms in Central Europe for a long time. Revanchiste trends in the West which question the political settlement in Europe can only be defined as a violation of the Helsinki Accords.

But what are the further prospects?

This question was touched upon in one way or another in many speeches by the symposium's participants. The difference of expressed opinions, viewpoints, and assessments regarding the particular aspects of the all-European process by no means lessens the significance of the general ideas brought out on ways to improve and stabilize the political, economic, cultural, and other ties among states with different social orders.

The fundamental problem of contemporary international relations is to establish a new form of political thinking which corresponds to the realities of the nuclear age. This demands that stereotypes of thinking which took shape earlier and which were based on the supposedly most reliable guarantee of security -- force of arms -- be overcome. Critically evaluating such ideas, G. Leonard (USA) rejected the concept of security based on the quest for nuclear supremacy. "It is politically ludicrous and morally brutal to

plan the 'defense' of Western Europe using weapons which will probably destroy it," he noted. "Our enemy is nuclear arms, nuclear war, and the entire system of war business in all its aspects." American medium-range nuclear weapons, which are central to NATO strategy, must be removed from the continent's territory, G. Leonard believes. And not simply transferred to military ships or airports in the United States where they can easily be returned to Europe, but completely destroyed. The principle of equality and equal security presupposes that such steps be taken, he noted.

Like other participants in the symposium, the American expert protested against moving the arms race into space. He believes that the "Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) which the U.S. administration is trying to impose on its allies cannot be regarded as defense and cannot save the world from the threat of nuclear conflict. On the contrary, in this case all the dangers stemming from intensifying the arms race would increase unpredictably. The "Star Wars" program can fundamentally destabilize the system of international relations since, noted G. Leonard, the SDI "cannot improve the chances for achieving an important agreement on strategic weapons but would be completely incompatible with the prospects of substantially reducing offensive weapons."

The conviction of some strategists that ordinary weapons can insure security on the continent contradicts the interests of the peoples of Europe to no small extent. The continuous refinement of nonnuclear weapons for conducting war has substantially increased their harmful impact. In a settled region such as the European region, the consequences of armed conflict even using ordinary weapons are most tragic. And the plans for a massive crippling nonnuclear strike being developed by the European NATO command, such as the "Eierbettel," confirm this. This position was reflected in B. Carlsson's speech which, among other things, noted: "The new conflict in Europe can be an indescribable catastrophe even when nuclear weapons are not used. Taking into account the number of atomic power plants, chemical enterprises, and burial places for toxic wastes, the impact of conventional war to a certain degree could be compared to a conflict using a limited number of nuclear weapons. In conditions of the high population density, victims among the civilian population would be enormous. Vast regions would become lifeless and possibly uninhabitable in the future. The conclusions which must be drawn for the policy of European security are obvious. Detente and monitoring of weapons is the only way to survive." In fact, an orientation toward negotiations and other political mechanisms for insuring security may be the only reasonable possibility of reducing the danger of war on the European continent. This fully corresponds to the spirit of Helsinki.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries firmly support these concepts of security. The Soviet position on questions of political and military detente was given in T.T. Timofeyev's report. In the spirit of Helsinki the Soviet Union proposed a complex of important initiatives focused on fulfilling all sections of the Final Act, including the problem of reducing nuclear and other weapons. The USSR reinforces its constructive proposals with concrete steps focused on creating a favorable atmosphere of trust in all negotiations being conducted in the interests of achieving mutually acceptable agreements. Thus, in April 1985 the Soviet Union unilaterally stopped deployment of its medium-range missiles and carrying out other reciprocal

measures in Europe. Back in 1983 the unilateral Soviet moratorium on launching antisatellite systems into space was announced. The moratorium on nuclear explosions introduced on 6 August 1985 was the latest major Soviet initiative.

Following the path of fulfilling the decisions of the Helsinki Conference, the person giving the report noted, the USSR fixed the 10 principles of the Final Act in its Basic Law (Constitution) as mandatory norms in interrelations with foreign states. The norms worked out in Helsinki thereby became the basis of the Soviet Union's interrelations not only with the European states but also with all other countries of the globe. The USSR's efforts have found expression in a large number of treaties and agreements and in setting up the system of political consultations and creating intergovernmental joint commissions on scientific-technical and economic cooperation, and in the entire complex of ties and contacts with the states of different social affiliations. The principles agreed upon in Helsinki have been elevated to the rank of national legal norms in many other states of the socialist community. Among other things, the representative of the Polish Institute of International Relations A.D. Rotfeld noted that soon after the Helsinki Conference, the Polish People's Republic Council of Ministers adopted a decree which obligated all central ministries and departments to follow the principles of the Final Act of the all-European conference in their activities.

Those participating in the symposium praised the contribution of the host country of the Helsinki Conference to improving the political climate in Europe. Support was expressed for the proposals made at one time by President U.K. Kekkonen to create and register in international law a zone free from nuclear weapons in northern Europe. These types of proposals receive broad support from the world community and are considered by it as an alternative to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and an effective means of maintaining the security of countries and of entire regions of the planet. The idea of a nonnuclear zone is not only finding ever greater numbers of supporters in northern Europe but also in the Balkans and outside Europe -- in the Far East and in the Asia-Pacific Ocean Region. The speeches by representatives of various political parties and social organizations of Finland and other countries demonstrated how great the impact of these proposals is among members of parliaments and different social forces in the countries of Northern Europe.

The constructive nature of the debates at the symposium by no means indicated an absence of ideological differences of opinion. In criticizing the aggressive foreign policy course of the U.S. administration, some of the participants nonetheless gave tribute to a certain degree to those concepts whose supporters have tried to lay "equal responsibility" for the aggravated situation in the world on the Soviet Union. These types of assessments are based on the stereotypes prevalent in the West which do not take into account the practical peace initiatives of the USSR. For example, as was clear from the speech by the Norwegian scientists M. Seter, in his opinion the logic of relations between two "superpowers" has a certain fatal aspect for the destiny of Europe. The creation of an effective system of European security can be insured, in his opinion, on the one hand -- by the European NATO allies extricating themselves from the "control" of the United States and, on the

other -- by the OVD [Warsaw Pact Organization] extricating themselves from the "control" of the USSR. This point of view, however, was not supported by most of those participating in the symposium.

The militaristic precepts of those transoceanic circles who fight for intensifying the arms race and moving it into space contradict the interests of peaceful economic cooperation. Many state and public figures of Western Europe who participated in the debate regarding the prospects and possible consequences of the European states' participating in realizing projects within the framework of the U.S. administration's so-called SDI have come to this conclusion. The speech by the prominent economist and general secretary of the "Finnish Champions of Peace" organization Y. Pakaslakhtu was dedicated to certain aspects of the impact of these programs on the European economy. "If the Western European countries were to take part in realizing the SDI, it would have a negative effect on their economy, which would be doubly advantageous for the United States," the speaker concluded. Participating in Washington's plans to ready "Star Wars" would lead to using a significant part of national income and research and financial resources of the countries of Western Europe in the political and military interests of the United States. This would seriously limit the possibilities of developing national economies, reduce the competitiveness of many sectors of Western European industry, and at the same time strengthen the positions of the military-industrial complex even more, with all the resulting negative economic consequences for the working people and the broad popular masses of the countries of Western Europe.

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" was criticized from similar positions at meetings of the section which discussed the problems of cooperation in the field of science and technology. In his speech E. Helander, the representative of the Academy of Sciences of Finland, pointed out the danger of enlisting an ever-greater number of talented scientists and technicians in military industry. Thus, the financing of the SDI comprises a rather large part of all expenditures for scientific research and other developments of the United States, and the Pentagon plans to increase it even further in the future. In 1984 more than 5,000 skilled scientists and technicians were engaged in developing technology for the SDI alone, while by 1987 they are to be increased to 18,000. The participants in the symposium who spoke in the section expressed a unanimous desire to step up efforts to put the achievements of contemporary science and technology at the service of the cause of consolidating peace and economic and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: "Rabochiy klass i sovremennyy mir", 1985

/9604

CSO: 5200/1507

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

MOSCOW TV CITES MEXICAN CD AMBASSADOR ROBLES ON LACK OF PROGRESS

LD271803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jul 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report over video by V. Dmitriyev]

[Text] The summer session of the Conference on Disarmament continues its work in Geneva. In the opinion of many participants in the talks, and there are representatives from 40 countries, the work aimed at achieving an agreement on renunciation of nuclear tests drags on needlessly. Control is the major problem. Our country's position is clear: We are in favor of the strictest control. A Soviet delegation has put forward a proposal for a group of experts-seismologists, working within the framework of the conference, to start work on a special operative system of signal transmission. This system would be based on the foundations of international seismic control over the ban on nuclear weapons tests.

Garcia Robles, head of the Mexican delegation and Nobel Peace Prize laureate, says the full ban on nuclear weapons tests would be one of the most important stages on the path toward universal disarmament. There is no other problem today which has been so studied from all aspects as the problem of nuclear tests. The only thing of which there is a shortage is political will. This lack of political will from Washington and its closest allies hinders progress at the Geneva conference in such an important problem as the ban on nuclear weapons tests. [video shows the conference in progress, with shots of delegates and of the Mexican representative]

/9604

CSO: 5200/1507

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR'S ISRAELYAN CRITICIZES AMERICAN STANCE AT CD

LD311230 Warsaw PAP in English 1230 GMT 31 Jul 86

[Text] Geneva, July 31 ← Chief Soviet delegate to the 40-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva granted an interview to PAP's Edward Dylawski, evaluating the current state of the disarmament negotiations and debates in the Swiss capital.

Ambassador Viktor Israelyan started by saying that the contents and character of any diplomatic negotiations depend on the political will on the part of the governments involved. "In tune with an agreement reached in November last year between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan concerning a speeding up of the disarmament negotiation process, the Soviet Union continues to do all that is possible to speed up both bilateral and multilateral negotiations," he said. "It can be seen from Gorbachev's speeches and in many Soviet proposals. The Soviet stand on acceleration of disarmament talks has passed the test of deeds, which cannot be said of the other side.

"So far I can see no new situation as far as the American stance is concerned. No new American proposals have been tabled, for instance, in the talks on a chemical weapons ban, in which I am taking part. The same could be said of the talks on a nuclear test ban," Israelyan said. Nuclear arms, which constitute the single most important issue in disarmament negotiations, has not become a topic of a disarmament conference yet, he added. "We have many concrete drafts and proposals. Also Soviet proposals have been put forth concerning a ban on the use of nuclear arms or termination of nuclear testing.

"But the decisive issue is the presence of political will towards agreements or conventions. If it existed on the part of the Western states, agreements could be reached even within several months," Israelyan assured. "The same applies to the chemical weapons talks. We have made many important suggestions on the elimination of chemical weapons. There was a role here also with the Polish delegation to the disarmament conference. The coordinator for the chemical arms ban, head of the Polish delegation also led the disarmament conference's committee for the chemical weapons ban.

"But here the issue is also the U.S. openness to discuss a convention on a chemical weapons ban. If it was there, the convention could be signed still this year," he said. "Still, if we talk about disarmament, then nuclear arms are the most important question. There is no alternative to nuclear disarmament.

"However, the world has not two but five nuclear powers and no nuclear disarmament will be possible without the other ones joining it. The disarmament conference grouping all the five nuclear powers is a good forum for not just bilateral, but multilateral talks on nuclear disarmament, to which the USSR attaches greatest importance. But so far it has failed to produce the full results for which it has been called," Israelyan told PAP.



EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRC JOURNAL ON WARSAW PACT DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL

HK060933 Beijing SHIJIE ZHISHI in Chinese No 14, 16 Jul 86 pp 4-5

[Article by Wu Jun: "Warsaw Pact Puts Forward New Proposal on Disarmament"]

[Text] On 11 June, the Warsaw Pact appealed to NATO and European countries, calling for large-scale disarmament in Europe, which, the Warsaw Pact suggested, could be carried out in two stages. The first stage: Within 1 or 2 years, the Warsaw Pact and NATO will each by reduce their military forces by 100,000 to 150,000; the second stage: by the beginning of 1990's, the Warsaw Pact and NATO will have reduced their respective military forces in Europe by 25 percent, namely a reduction of 500,000 troops on each side. The Warsaw Pact's proposal also called for a simultaneous reduction of the tactical attack [zhan shu da ji 2069 2611 2092 2345] air forces and strategic theater nuclear weapons whose firing range is less than 1,000 km.

Although the proposal was put forward by the Warsaw Pact, the general principle for the proposal was already announced by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party in the German Democratic Republic on 18 April. So world opinion believes that the Warsaw Pact's new proposals is just a component part of a series of proposals on disarmament put forward by the Soviet Union.

Compared with the past Soviet proposals on disarmament in Europe, the new proposal put forward by the Warsaw Pact has some new proposals:

1. For the first time, the Soviet bloc has put forward a proposal on disarmament in all Europe. The past Soviet proposal on disarmament in Central Europe only included east of the Rhine, west of Wisla, south of the Baltic Sea north of the Alps while the proposal on disarmament put forward by Warsaw Pact this time included all of Europe from the Urals to the Atlantic, covering a far wider area than before. The past Soviet proposal on disarmament in Central Europe only included the NATO troops stationed in West Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and Belgium and the Warsaw Pact troops stationed in the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Poland while the proposal on disarmament put forward by the Warsaw Pact this time called for a reduction of troops in 33 European countries and U.S. and Canadian troops stationed in Europe, thus involving a much bigger reduction of troops.

2. The Warsaw Pact's new proposal has made specific requirements for a reduction of military forces, such as the two stages of disarmament: 100,000-150,000 and 500,000 respectively, and so on.

3. The Warsaw Pact's new proposal made further concessions on the question of nuclear verification, clearly proposing the use of different methods of nuclear verification at different stages, such as the use of national technological methods and international technological methods to carry out nuclear verification, even including necessary spot checks; the Warsaw Pact's new proposal also proposed the establishment of an international consultation committee comprised of representatives of the NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries, the relevant neutral countries, nonaligned countries and other European countries, and the establishment of supervision stations formed by the representatives of the international consultation committee at the hub of major railroads, major airports and major ports. The West thought that compared with the Soviet bloc's past attitude of avoiding the question of nuclear verification, this new proposal put forward by the Warsaw Pact has indeed shown some flexibility on the side of the Warsaw Pact.

Why did the Warsaw Pact put forward such a proposal? Public opinion in the West believes that the Soviet Union is trying to coordinate this proposal with the disarmament talks in Europe and under take a peace offensive through a disarmament agreement in order to gain the initiative.

Presently, two talks on disarmament in Europe are being held. One is the Conference on Disarmament in Europe [CDE] held in Stockholm. The conference is being held according to the resolution of the subsequent meeting of the European security conference held in Madrid. The CDE held in Stockholm is attended by 33 European countries, and the United States and Canada. Eight rounds of negotiations have been held since the conference first began at the beginning of 1984. The first stage of the conference will discuss trust measures and will end in September this year. The subsequent meeting of the European security conference will be held in Vienna in November this year, which will decide whether the conference will enter the second stage to discuss the question of disarmament in Europe. So, the proposal on disarmament first put forward by the Soviet Union is aimed at gaining a favorable position at the next round of the CDE. Another meeting is the negotiation on a common reduction of troops and arms in Central Europe (simply called the Central European disarmament negotiations). The meeting will be attended by seven NATO countries (Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Britain, the United States and Canada) and four Warsaw Pact countries (Poland, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union). Besides, five other NATO countries and three other Warsaw Pact countries will attend the meeting as observers. Thirty-nine rounds of negotiations have been held since 1974. Although the two blocs have put forward their own plans for arms reduction, they have not reached an agreement owing to their differences on some fundamental questions.

The Warsaw Pact's new proposal has not made any concessions on some substantive questions, which can mainly be seen in the following three aspects:

1. On the question of whether the Warsaw Pact and NATO will carry out parallel arms reduction or proportionate arms reduction. NATO thinks that Warsaw Pact now is 150,000 to 200,000 more troops and a larger number of armored vehicles in Central Europe than NATO. And throughout Europe, the Warsaw Pact has also gained the upper hand. For example, the Warsaw Pact has approximately four million troops in Europe while NATO has only 2.6 million troops. Because of the imbalance of military forces in Europe, if parallel arms reduction is to be carried out the Warsaw Pact's military superiority in Europe will increase. [paragraph continues]



Therefore, NATO has insisted on carrying out proportionate arms reduction with the Warsaw Pact. Thinking that the military strengths of the two big military blocs are now generally balanced, the Warsaw Pact now still insists on carrying out parallel arms reduction. The Warsaw Pact's latest proposal on the reduction of 100,000 to 150,000 and 500,000 armed forces was put forward according to the principle of parallel reduction. So NATO immediately pointed out that the proposal has ignored the fact that the Warsaw Pact now has superiority in conventional armed forces.

2. On the question of whether to include tactical nuclear weapons in arms reduction. NATO has always wanted to use its nuclear superiority to offset the Warsaw Pact's conventional superiority and demanded the European disarmament talks be limited to the reduction of conventional weapons. Although the United States has withdrawn 1,000 nuclear warheads, the West has always thought that the question of nuclear weapons, which is very complicated, should not be included in the European disarmament talks. So this time, NATO will probably not accept the Warsaw Pact's proposal to include the reduction of nuclear weapons in the European disarmament talks.

3. On the question of how to deal with the reduction of military equipment. In its latest proposal, the Warsaw Pact suggests that the reduced part of military forces be disbanded according to military organization, such as corps, units and elements. The reduced part of military equipment and armament can either be destroyed or stored on each other's own land according to stipulations. This means that the reduced part of the Soviet military equipment and armament can either be destroyed or transported to the east of the Urals while the reduced part of the U.S. and Canadian military equipment and armament can also be destroyed or transported back to the other shore of the Atlantic. Because the Soviet Union has natural geographic advantages, in a case of emergency, it will be able to transport its military equipment and armament back to the front within a short time while the United States and Canada will need to transport their military equipment and armament back to the front by travelling across the ocean. So the United States thinks that such a new proposal will be detrimental to its "forward-deployment" strategy.

Since the Warsaw Pact put forward its proposal on the reduction of military forces in Europe, the responses of the Western countries have generally been cautious. A representative of NATO has said that NATO will carefully consider the proposal and ask the special work group specialized in the study of conventional weapons to study the proposal while a spokesman for the United States has stressed that the West has put forward its own proposal and the Warsaw Pact should first of all make a positive and constructive response at the Central European disarmament talks and at the European disarmament conference.

Observers think that at present the Warsaw Pact's proposal is just a bargaining position in the negotiation on reducing military forces in Europe, and in the future, the two sides will continue to bargain for a long time. It is generally predicted that the latest Warsaw Pact's proposal will probably be discussed at the second stage of the Stockholm European disarmament conference or will result in having the Vienna Central European disarmament talks include all of Europe so that other European countries can participate in the talks or in the setting-up of a new special forum on disarmament on Europe.

/9738

CSO: 5200/4062

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### PHILIPPINE FOREIGN MINISTER ANNOUNCES ASEAN NUCLEAR-FREE STAND

#### Conference Disclosure

Quezon City ANG PAHAYAGANG MALAYA in English 28 Jun 86 pp 1, 7

[Article by Chit Estella]

[Text]

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations reiterated yesterday its commitment to create a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality and to study the possibility of declaring a nuclear weapons-free zone even as the United States warned that a ban on the presence of nuclear weapons could lead to a "tragedy for the Free World."

At a press conference attended by the foreign ministers of ASEAN and its dialogue partners, Vice President Salvador H. Laurel, chairman of the post-ministerial conference, said, "We would like to see a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality in our region."

He added there is a "strong move" to declare a nuclear weapons-free zone in the region, a matter which, although not yet finally decided upon by the regional organization, was submitted to its senior officers for study.

Malaysian Foreign Minister Tengku Ahmad Rithauddeen said the declaration of a nuclear weapons-free zone must be done by an entire region, not just by one country.

If only one country would make such a declaration, he said, "it will not be useful. It will have no effect."

Indonesian Foreign Minister Mochtar Kusumaatmadja said the creation of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality (ZOPFAN) is basically a political concept for Southeast Asia.

"It is particularly a wish of Southeast Asia after going through 30 years of war," the Indonesian official said.

On the nuclear weapons-free zone concept, Kusumaatmadja said although it is one goal that ASEAN can strive for, the regional group "must be realistic about this."

He reminded the organization of the presence of military bases in the region and described it as "a reality, not something we can wish away."

The ASEAN ministers were reacting to a question on whether or not their countries would follow New Zealand's example of declaring a nuclear weapons ban in its territory, a move which the United States viewed as an act which amounted to a ban on its vessels in that country.

US Secretary of State George Shultz said it would be a "a tragedy for the Free World if New Zealand's example is followed by other nations."

"We do not have nuclear weapons on our ships because we like them," Shultz said. Rather, the nuclear weapons were regarded as a necessity to prevent nations from being subjected to nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union.

Earlier, he told the ASEAN foreign ministers that his government would now base its actions by what the Soviet Union does.

In a separate press conference, New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange said his country's decision to ban nuclear weapons within its territory was not the result of any anti-American sentiment.

He disputed contentions of US officials that the anti-nuclear policy of New Zealand meant a ban on all American ships and other vessels. "We welcome US Navy ships to New Zealand, but not nuclear-armed or propelled ships," he said.

He added that it did not matter where such a ship would come from.

At the same time, he denied that his country was ignoring its defense responsibility in the region. He said New Zealand's move only meant that starting 1985, it no longer has a military treaty with the United States.

He said the people of his country do not feel any less secure as a result of banning nuclear weapons and consequently losing US security guarantee because New Zealand's treaty with the US, namely the ANZUS, never served as a security guarantee.

Despite the ban on nuclear weapons, both Shultz and Lange said relations between their countries remain friendly. No economic sanctions had been imposed on New Zealand.

Meanwhile, Vice President Laurel said the new government has decided that no nuclear weapons in the country may be stored without its consent.

ANZUS Issue 'Debate'

Tokyo KYODO in English 1106 GMT 27 Jun 86

[By Antonio Kamiya]

[Text] Manila, June 27 KYODO -- The foreign ministers of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) ended two days of talks here with their dialogue partners from the industrialized world with the host Philippines declaring the meeting a complete success.

"I believe that we have achieved our objective of having a frank and fruitful dialogue with our partners," Philippine Vice President and Foreign Minister Salvador Laurel declared at a press conference.

The press conference, held at the end of a series of talks between ASEAN and its dialogue partners, however, turned into a running debate over nuclear weapons stemming from New Zealand's refusal to allow U.S. nuclear-armed or nuclear-powered ships to enter its ports.

New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, both here to attend the dialogue, faced a spate of questions over the nuclear impasse, with ASEAN ministers drawn into the fray. "Our position is that nuclear weapons are not supposed to be deployed at the (American) military bases in the Philippines," Laurel said.

On ASEAN's contacts with its industrial partners, Laurel said the talks have enabled ASEAN foreign ministers to air their views, ranging from trade protectionism and the perennial Kampuchean issue to drug abuse and international terrorism.

Japan's Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe contributed to the discussions by outlining the basic Japanese foreign policy to the region -- a stand which Laurel said has given ASEAN better understanding of Japan's regional policy. The speech, the content of which is being touted in Japan as the "Abe Doctrine," pledged stepped up economic aid to the region and a continuous dialogue along with a commitment that Japan will not become a military power. The Abe speech "marked no major departure of Japan's foreign policy but it sharpened the focus of Japan's policy vis-a-vis ASEAN," Laurel said.

Shultz also defended the outcome of the ASEAN conference, saying that discussions have "raised people's consciousness" over a variety of issues, notably trade protectionism. Trade protectionism is a threat to the standard of living, potentially destabilizing the strategic balance in the region, Shultz said.

It was, however, the nuclear dispute that drew the sharpest comments from Shultz and New Zealand Prime Minister Lange, who was seated next to the American secretary of state. Shultz, who had a separate meeting with Lange earlier in the day, said the New Zealand nonnuclear policy has removed "one of the essences" of ANZUS, the trilateral security treaty among the U.S., Australia and New Zealand.

Shultz said the United States and New Zealand are no longer military allies, but sought to deny that the nuclear dispute would spill over into wider bilateral relations with New Zealand.

"The allies are still friends," he said. Lange, who attended the ASEAN conference in his capacity as foreign minister, defended his government's nonnuclear policy, arguing that the presence of nuclear weapons in New Zealand would invite a nuclear attack.

The enlarged ASEAN meeting -- which brings together the foreign ministers from the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the representatives of the European Community -- is an established feature of the annual ASEAN foreign ministerial meeting. ASEAN groups Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, and Brunei.

### Laurel Reassures ASEAN on Nuclear Weapons

Manila THE NEWS HERALD in English 28 Jun 86 pp 1, 6

[Text] Vice President and Foreign Minister Salvador H. Laurel last night assured the Association of Southeast Asian Nations that there are no nuclear weapons in the two United States military bases in the Philippines.

Laurel, chairman of the ninth ASEAN ministerial meeting, was responding to a query at a postministerial press conference at the Philippine Plaza Hotel, on the possibility that missiles with nuclear warheads are stored at the Subic naval and Clark airbase. "We have Filipino base commanders in these two U.S. facilities and they have guaranteed that there are no nuclear weapons stored there," Laurel said.

Laurel recalled how the then opposition had tried to coax former President Marcos to make a categorical denial or confirmation of the presence of a nuclear arsenal in the two U.S. military facilities. It was only when the new government took over that there was a more convincing guaranty that the U.S. has no nuclear armaments in the two bases. The basis of Laurel's confidence is the bilateral agreement between the two governments that no such weapons be kept in the two bases without prior knowledge of the Philippines.

At any rate, Laurel said, the new government will respect the bases agreement up to 1991, its expiry date, after which the matter is open to negotiation. Sources said the ASEAN partners of the Philippines have been making discreet inquiries about the presence of nuclear warheads in the two military installations.

Earlier, on the eve of the conclusion of the ASEAN post-ministerial dialog, U.S. State Secretary George Shultz tried to rally an ASEAN wary of a nuclear showdown between the U.S. and the Soviet Union behind the U.S. decision to terminate the disarmament talks because of Russian bad faith. At the same time, Shultz warned U.S. allies not to follow the example of New Zealand which has refused to have U.S. nuclear-powered vessels call at its ports.

Such non-cooperation has caused the U.S. to withdraw the security guaranty of ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand and U.S. nuclear defense pact) from New Zealand. The ASEAN had earlier served notice to work for a nuclear-free zone for Southeast Asia in accordance with its vow to conclude a future treaty of peace, freedom and neutrality in the region.

But ASEAN's decision has been made awkward by the presence of foreign military installations in the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore.

ASEAN leaders pronounced the recently concluded ministerial conference a success, citing the presence of dialog partners from U.S., Canada, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and the European Community as proofs of its success.

Shultz reiterated the pledge of the Reagan administration to fight protectionist legislation in the U.S. Congress adding that the White House will eventually prevail. He assailed protectionist legislation as a threat to standards of living and political freedom as he said that the determination of ASEAN to combat such protectionism was a consciousness of a sense of mutual need and cooperation.

#### Retention of U.S. Bases Urged

Manila Far East Broadcasting Company in English 2300 GMT 29 Jun 86

[Text]

Foreign ministers of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations are lobbying for the retention of the U.S. bases in the Philippines. They have let it be known to the Philippine Government during the recent ASEAN ministerial meeting in Manila that it is necessary for the Philippines to keep the bases to maintain the regional balance of power in Asia and the Pacific.

The ASEAN position was disclosed by official sources, although there was no official announcement at the recent ASEAN meeting. The ASEAN ministers were reported to hold the position that the very essence of the zone of peace, freedom, and neutrality in the region is not possible without the U.S. military presence in the bases in the Philippines.

/13046

CSO: 5200/4322

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### SOUTH PACIFIC FORUM MISTRUSTS AUSTRALIAN FREE ZONE TREATY

Melbourne THE AGE in English 19 Jul 86 p 11

["State of the Nation" Column by Peter Cole Adams: "Fiji Will Be No Pacific Paradise for Hawke"]

[Text]

**G**OROKA. — Forget about Pacific idylls. Next month's meeting of the leaders of the 13 member states of the South Pacific Forum in Fiji is likely to be a decidedly uncomfortable occasion for Australia.

We will not be cast as the supreme villain — that role is reserved for the French — but the French will not be there and we will. All the indications are that Bob Hawke's diplomatic skills will be sorely tested.

This week's pre-forum Melanesian summit in Goroka, attended by the leaders of Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands, has set the scene for some serious argument over nuclear issues and New Caledonia.

Australia's pet regional initiative, the notably toothless South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty, will certainly come under verbal fire in Fiji. There may well be a concerted Melanesian bid to have the treaty strengthened through amendment.

The formal joint communique issued in Goroka on Thursday does not specifically demand changes to the treaty. It simply reaffirms the three leaders' desire for "effective arrangements in the South Pacific to prohibit testing of nuclear devices and dumping and disposal of radioactive nuclear waste in the South Pacific". The key

word in this passage is "effective". The Melanesian leaders made it quite plain in their statements that they do not think the treaty can be effective in its present form.

The cautious wording of the joint communique reflected the awkward position in which Papua New Guinea's Prime Minister, Mr Wingti, finds himself. Papua New Guinea is one of the nine South Pacific nations which have signed the treaty. That decision was taken by the previous Somare Government. Mr Wingti told 'The Age' in an interview that his Government felt bound by that decision, and that the treaty would be put to Parliament at some time for ratification, though its chances of surviving a vote seem doubtful. So far only three nations have ratified it. Eight ratifications are necessary to have it registered with the United Nations.

Mr Wingti says flatly that there is room for improvement in the treaty. "If I had been in office at the time the treaty was drawn up our attitude would have been different," he said. "I would have said, 'look Australia, before you ask other countries to sign, you had better do certain things'."

He went on to refer to Australia's exports of uranium to France, an issue which has been raised several times in the past, and again this week, by Vanuatu's Prime Minister, Father Walter Lini, who

argues that there is no way of monitoring the uses to which the French might put Australian uranium.

Mr Wingti is slightly more tactful. There is, he says, a "contradiction" in Australian policy. "We have to be genuine about these things," he said. "If we really mean what we say (about wanting a nuclear-free Pacific), then concrete actions have to be taken."

Mr Wingti did not say just what action he had in mind. It is not the Melanesian way to go into unnecessary details. But what is certain is that there is a deal of scepticism in these parts about Australia's anti-nuclear sincerity. Quite apart from uranium exports, there is the matter of Australia's readiness to provide communication, harbor and airport facilities to the US, one of the nuclear superpowers.

The truth is, of course, that no nuclear-free-zone treaty will be worth the paper it is written on unless the nuclear powers are prepared to sign the protocols and abide by them. Moreover, a treaty any tougher than the pallid one Australia has been pushing would certainly not be approved by the Americans, let alone by the French.

But that does not prevent Australia from looking a little hypocritical in Melanesian eyes. Nor will our image be improved if we continue to rely on rhetoric to express our displeasure at Margaret Thatcher's refusal to consider economic sanctions against South Africa. Mr Wingti, at considerable political risk to himself, in this sport-mad country, this week lined up Papua New Guinea with the other nations boycotting the Commonwealth Games. He will not be impressed if Australia competes, particularly as the games will be held just before the South Pacific Forum gets under way.

Probably the best way for Australia to retain credibility at the Fiji meeting would be to support Melanesian attempts to increase pressure on France to move towards early and genuine independence for New Caledonia. Specifically, the Melanesian countries want New Caledonia to be put back on the list of non-self-governing territories on the formal agenda of the United Nations committee that deals with decolonisation.

The Hawke Government has yet to declare its position on UN listing, but the recent ALP conference in Hobart passed a resolution declaring that the Kanak people of New Caledonia had an inherent right to self-determination and independence "in accordance with the expressed wishes of those people in New Caledonia of whom it can be properly said that they are genuine, long-term and permanent settlers."

The resolution described the Fabius plan put forward by the previous Socialist Government in Paris as a credible effort to move towards self-determination and independence.

Significantly, it suggested that, if the new Conservative French Government retreated from the Fabius plan, then placing New Caledonia on the UN list would be "an appropriate and non-violent democratic means of ensuring that progress towards self-determination and independence becomes an international responsibility."

So Mr Hawke has a mandate from his party to support moves to increase the pressure on France. Given that New Caledonia is the overriding item on the international agenda of the Melanesian states, and given the growing scepticism about Australian attitudes in the South Pacific, the Prime Minister would probably be wise to exercise that mandate.

/13046  
CSO: 5200/4323

22 August 1986

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

## BRIEFS

SOUTH PACIFIC NFZ TREATY SIGNED---Nauru has become the tenth nation to sign the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation (SPEC) announced yesterday. The signing by Nauru President Hammer de Roburt took place at a ceremony at SPEC headquarters in Suva, the announcement said. [Text] [Suva THE FIJI TIMES in English 22 Jul 86 p 1] /9317

KOHL SUPPORTS TEST BAN APPEAL--Bonn, 6 Aug (DPA)--Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl has supported in a letter the appeal of the heads of state and government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania for a comprehensive nuclear test ban and welcomed the talks by experts between the United States and the Soviet Union in this area. Government spokesman Herbert Schmuelling stated in Bonn that the letter was sent at the end of July to the Group of Six, who are meeting again in Mexico on Wednesday. Kohl described in his letter the German position on the most important subject areas of international disarmament and arms control policy. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 1251 GMT 6 Aug 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2735



RELATED ISSUES

NEW JAPANESE FOREIGN MINISTER STRESSES PEACE, DISARMAMENT

OW230925 Tokyo KYODO in English 0915 GMT 23 Jul 86

[Text] Tokyo, July 23 KYODO -- New Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari, a native of atomic-bombed Nagasaki, said Wednesday Japan should seek peace and disarmament of the world. Kuranari, who belongs to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone's faction in the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party, also said close cooperation between the prime minister and the foreign minister is necessary in steering Japan's foreign relations.

Kuranari expressed these views in a meeting with the press at the foreign ministry. "I lost my home in the 1945 atomic bombing. My wife is also an A-bomb victim. A nuclear attack should never be repeated," the 67-year-old Kuranari said. "Ideals and realities regarding peace and disarmament are divided sharply at present. But I want to make utmost efforts to help bring about peace in the world," Kuranari said, stressing the need for Japan to promote peace and disarmament diplomacy.

Kuranari said he supports Nakasone's so-called "presidential-style" diplomacy to set an overall Japanese course of diplomacy, but he said every bilateral and international problem cannot be solved through summit talks between Nakasone and leaders of other nations, stressing the need of full support of the foreign minister. Kuranari said he would like to have talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz when he visits New York to attend the United Nations General Assembly meeting in autumn. Whether he will go to the U.S. before the assembly has not yet been decided, he said.

Kuranari said trade frictions are inevitable among industrially advanced nations, like Japan, the United States and the European Community.

"What is needed is to seek ways to ease the frictions through continuous talks with trading partners," said Kuranari, a businessman-turned politician who had chaired the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party's special panel on international economic relations.

Kuranari also said in the interview:

-- Japan should increase official development assistance, but it is also important to check whether the aid funds are being used effectively to help people in recipient countries. Commodity assistance rather than large projects is preferable, he said.

-- Japan welcomes a visit by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to Japan before Nakasone goes to the Soviet Union.

-- In helping solve problems in the Middle East, including the Iran-Iraq war, it will be necessary for Japan to first gather detailed information about the area.  
--He has yet to decide whether to visit Yasukuni Shrine, where Japan's war dead and World War II war criminals are enshrined.  
-- He cannot comment on news reports that the planned visit to South Korea by Crown Prince Akihito and Princess Michiko has been postponed.  
-- On the controversial issue of Japanese school textbooks on history, he will respect feelings of neighboring countries on the basis of the Japanese Government's pledge that school textbooks would be checked while giving full consideration to relations with Asian neighbors.

/9738

CSO: 5260/114

RELATED ISSUES

RSA'S BISHOP TUTU INVITED TO HIROSHIMA PEACE FORUM

OW111159 Tokyo KYODO in English 0806 GMT 11 Jul 86

/Text/ Hiroshima, 11 Jul KYODO--Hiroshima city has invited South African Bishop Desmond Tutu and three other Nobel Prize winners to a peace symposium to be held here on 6 August, the city said Friday. The city will sponsor the symposium, "1986 Peace Summit in Hiroshima," in commemoration of the International Peace Year on the anniversary of its atomic bombing in 1945.

The Nobel Prize winners invited to the symposium are Tutu, 54; Linus Pauling, 85, U.S. chemist; Dorothy Hodgkin, 76, British chemist; and Sean MacBride, 82, former Irish foreign ministers. Tutu won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 for his efforts against apartheid in South Africa. He and the three other Nobel Prize winners will make keynote speeches at the symposium. Eight other Japanese and foreign intellectuals will be also invited to the symposium, the city said.

The symposium will discuss science for peace and what should be done to bring about lasting world peace and issue a Hiroshima appeal. Michio Nagai, Japanese adviser to the UN University rector, will attend the symposium as a coordinator.

/12228

CSO: 5260/109

JPRS-TAC-86-068  
22 August 1986

## RELATED ISSUES

RSA'S BISHOP TUTU, USSR'S BOGDANOV SPEAK AFTER JAPAN PEACE MEETING

OW051215 Tokyo KYODO in English 1201 GMT 5 Aug 86

[By Suvendrini Suguro]

[Text] Hiroshima, Aug 5 KYODO -- Archbishop Desmond Mpilo Tutu of Johannesburg, South Africa, and winner of 1984 Nobel Peace Prize, said Tuesday that he hopes the suffering of the atom bomb victims of August 6, 1945 will not have been in vain. "I am devastated at the nightmarish effects of the atom bomb on the people of Hiroshima and realize I must work harder for world peace," he said at a press conference on the eve of the 41st anniversary of Hiroshima's atomic bombing.

Linus Pauling, president of the Linus Pauling Institute of Science and Medicine in United States, and winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1962 and for chemistry in 1954 said, "the facts about the bombing are still a powerful presentation." A future nuclear war which will use atom bombs of a far greater intensity than what was dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki would be insanity, he said.

Radimor Bogdanov, deputy director of the Institute of the U.S. and Canadian Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, suggested that all world political leaders visit Hiroshima and listen to the experiences of the atom bomb victims. "It is only then they will know the madness they want to bring about," he said.

Seven world peace activists gave their impressions of the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the press after a tour of the city's a-bomb landmarks. They also offered flowers at the memorial cenotoph.

The other speakers were Dorothy Hodgkin, British president of the Pugwash Conference for the Prevention of Development of Nuclear Weapons in the World who won the Nobel Prize for Chemistry in 1964, Paul Crutzen, West German director of the Department of Chemical Atmosphere of the Max Planck Institute, Frank Blackaby, British director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, and Yasushi Akashi, vice secretary general of the United Nations Public Relations section.

Pauling said there must be a comprehensive ban on all nuclear testing including the underground tests that are allowed now. World political leaders are using the excuse of nuclear threat to spend more money on armaments. "The American people who believe this and support the Reagan administration program for the development of weapons are doing so because they have been deliberately misinformed," he said.

Bogdanov declared that for the world powers, the nuclear weapons they produce are toys. They will use them therefore as children will do without thinking about the devastating effects a nuclear war will have on the world, he said.

Hodgkins said "I am pleased with the efforts the scientists have made on setting up a system for a ban on nuclear testing," she said. She cited the example of the growing cooperation between U.S. and Soviet scientists to monitor and control future nuclear tests launched by the two countries.

Speaking on apartheid in South Africa, Archbishop Tutu said, "It is my conviction that unless the international community intervenes decisively on behalf of justice and freedom nothing will change. I am heartened that British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has imposed limited economic sanctions on the government of South Africa. It shows that she can be persuaded by the people." he declared.

/9738

CSO: 5260/116

JPRS-TAC-86-068  
22 August 1986

#### RELATED ISSUES

#### NEW ZEALAND: LANGE, SHULTZ DISCUSS NUCLEAR ISSUE IN MANILA

HK271106 Hong Kong AFP in English 1046 GMT 27 Jun 86

[Text] Manila, 27 Jun (AFP)--The United States and New Zealand must "part company" as military allies because of Wellington's ban on port visits by nuclear-powered or -armed ships, U.S. secretary of State George Shultz said Friday.

Mr Shultz said after meeting New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange that New Zealand, which may vote the government-imposed ban into law in August, cannot see its way clear to dropping the ban, "so we part company as friends, but we part company."

Mr Shultz told reporters that while New Zealand is a friend, it can no longer be considered an ally of the United States. The United States had ceased giving New Zealand military information and would now no longer give it the economic assistance and trade preference due to an "ally rather than just friends," a senior U.S. official said.

But Mr Shultz stressed that the ANZUS treaty, which joins Australia, New Zealand and the United States, would not be abrogated. "New Zealand takes itself out of the treaty structure but the treaty structure doesn't change." "Perhaps at some future time things will change in New Zealand and then the treaty structure will be there," he added.

U.S. policy is to neither confirm nor deny the nuclear status of its warships, but New Zealand has demanded that such status be indicated to stop nuclear visits, otherwise all ships are banned.

Mr Shultz and Mr Lange met Friday for the first time since September 1985, during a gathering here of foreign ministers from the non-communist association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its six major trading partners. Mr Lange, who is also New Zealand Foreign Minister, told a separate press conference that New Zealand would not withdraw from ANZUS because it still had "lots of common interests" with the United States. He said ANZUS was never meant to be a "security guarantee."

"The ANZUS treaty provided that in attack or case of attack the signatories would consult," he said. He added that the United States and New Zealand had not had a military relationship since February 26, 1985. On that date the United States virtually suspended defense ties with New Zealand after Wellington refused to permit the destroyer Buchanan to pay a scheduled visit unless Washington affirmed that it did not carry nuclear weapons.

"What is left of ANZUS is what was already there," Mr Lange said.

Mr Shultz had told reporters here Wednesday that if New Zealand passed planned legislation in August banning nuclear ships from its waters this would be an effective withdrawal from the ANZUS defense alliance.

A senior U.S. official said: "We've maintained the facade of an alliance for a long time. If they can't meet our conditions, there is no value in maintaining the facade." He said the ANZUS meeting in San Francisco on August 11 and 12 had already been slimmed down to include only Australia and the United States.

Mr Shultz said after meeting Mr Lange Friday: "We discussed the nuclear ship visit problem and our policy and New Zealand's policy and I am afraid that we were not able to resolve that issue," he added.

Mr Lange told reporters after the meeting that "we have come to review the two policies and the Secretary has said that the views at this stage are not reconcilable." "The New Zealand policy is not to have any nuclear weapons in New Zealand," he added.

Australian Foreign Minister Bill Hayden told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE after meeting with Mr Lange that the ANZUS treaty "stays in place as the Americans have declared." "We've maintained for two years a bilateral relationship with the United States, and a bilateral one with New Zealand. We'll continue to function as we have in the last two years," he said. "We don't see in operational terms, in practical terms any change on the last couple of years."

An arrangement has been reached that if the New Zealand law goes through, President Ronald Reagan and Prime Minister Bob Hawke will exchange letters affirming that the United States and Australia will keep the ANZUS treaty alive, the sources added.

/9738

CSO: 5260/105

RELATED ISSUES

PORTUGUESE GALLUP POLL ON DISARMAMENT, DIALOGUE

Lisbon SEMANARIO in Portuguese 12 Jul 86 pp 28-29

[Text] Gallup, represented in Portugal by Norma, inquired about the prospects that will open, or not open, as a result of the meetings between the two great powers. It is a survey exclusively for SEMANARIO. The number questioned is indicated in the first table, and the results are obviously expressed in percentages.

The survey also covers the degree of each person's information on problems of disarmament, which is valid for most of the great international problems. In this case as, to a certain extent, in others there were no surprises: The rule of television is absolute. It is to be noted only that radio lost out to newspapers.

What importance would you give to the signing in the next few years of an arms control treaty by the United States and the Soviet Union (Russia/USSR)?

Sample: 995 Portugal

Very important: 43

Important: 29

Not important: 5

No importance: 2

Don't know/no answer: 21

Have you heard or read anything about the resumption of conversations between the leaders of the USSR and the United States on arms control?

Yes: 62

No: 17

Don't know/no answer: 21

Do you think that those conversations between the United States and the USSR increased or diminished the possibilities for nuclear war: Or did they make no difference?

Increased: 9

Decreased: 41

No difference: 13

Don't know/no answer: 37



Aside from your own opinion, do you think that most people in your country believe that the possibilities for nuclear war increased, decreased or remained the same as a result of those conversations on arms control:

Increased: 10  
Decreased: 27  
Remained the same: 18  
Don't know/ no answer: 45

How frequently do you talk with others about the possibility of a nuclear war: almost never, perhaps once a month, about once a week, or more frequently, almost every day?

Never/almost never: 51  
About once a month: 19  
About once a week: 6  
Very often/daily: 4  
Don't know/no reply: 20

Here is a list of various sources of information. Which for you is the most important source of information on problems of rearmament and disarmament:

Newspapers: 14  
Magazines: 2  
Books, brochures, pamphlets: 1  
Radio: 7  
Television: 55  
Conversations: 3  
None of these: 1  
No reply: 17

And which of these sources of information is the least important for you:

Newspapers: 6  
Magazines: 8  
Books, brochures, pamphlets: 22  
Radio: 2  
Television: 2  
Conversations: 28  
None of these: 5  
No reply: 26

Television is the queen of information, followed by the daily newspapers. As for the least important, the opinions are divided among various magazines, books, radio, and simple conversation.

12942/6662  
CSO: 5200/2726

END